THE Successive Visibility OF THE CHURCH OF Which the PROTESTANTS are the soundest Members.

I. Defended against the Opposition of Mr. *William Johnson.*

II. Proved by many Arguments,

By *Richard Baxter.* Guil. Olivers

Whereto is added, 1. *An account of my judgement to Mr.* J. *how far Hereticks* are *or* are not *in the Church.*

2. *Mr.* J^s. *Explication of the most used terms; with my Quere's thereupon, and his Answer, and my Reply.*

3. *An Appendix about successive Ordination.*

4. *Letters between me, and* T. S. *a Papist, with a Narrative of the success.*

LONDON,

Printed by *R. W.* for *Nevil Simmons* Bookseller in *Kederminster*, and are to be sold by *Francis Tyton* at the three Daggers in *Fleet-street.* 1660.

BRITISH MUSEUM

The Preface.

Reader,

IF thou meet me at the threſhold with a [*What need any more againſt Popery then is written?*] I muſt anſwer thee, [No need, if all that is already written, were improved. Nor were there need of *any writings*, if men would not renounce their common ſenſes. We cannot hope or pretend, by any writings, to bring any controverſie to a plainer, better *iſſue*, then to reſolve it by the judgement of the common ſenſes of all the world: and yet this doth not end the controverſies between us and the Papiſts; whether *Bread* be *Bread*, and *Wine* be *Wine*, when they are ſeen, felt, taſted,

ed, &c. But ſome writings are uſefull to awake men to the uſe of *Reaſon*, and to help them to improve their other helps. And, as *Seneca* ſaith, *Multum egerunt qui ante nos fuerunt; ſed non peregerunt: ſuſcipiendi tamen ſunt*] Though I thought I had ſaid enough before in three or four former writings, yet the weight of the Queſtion here debated, and the common uſe thats made of it by the Papiſts, have perſwaded me, that this alſo will be uſefull to the Church.

And I muſt confeſs the moderation and ingenuity of the Gentleman that I contend with, did not only tempt me into the undertaking at the firſt, but alſo did incline my thoughts to a publication; there being here no ſtinking breath to annoy and drive away the Reader. I have learned by experience, that its only prudent, charitable, ſelf-denying, humble men, that are fit to be engaged in controverſies. We bring fire to Gun-powder, when we deal with proud malignant wretches, (ſuch as I have lately had to do with,) that have ſouls ſo forſaken, and conſciences ſo ſeared, as that they ſeem to make malicious lies, their glory and delight. Some think that the contending with ſuch, is a *needfull*, though an

unſavoury

unſavoury work: I confeſs, a Lyar is not to be encouraged, nor our juſt reputation to be prodigally caſt away, or contemptuouſly neglected. *Duo ſunt neceſſaria*, ſaith *Auguſtine*, *Conſcientia & fama: Conſcientia propter Deum; fama propter proximum.* But for our *ſelves*, *Gods approbation is enough*; and for *others*, if *Duty* ſatisfie them not, *contending* will not.

Bacchæ bacchanti ſi velis adverſarier,
Ex inſana inſaniorem facies; feriet ſæpius,
ſaith *Plaut.*

If *Truth* make blinded men our enemies, and the performance of our *duty* be our greateſt *crime*, and no purgation be left us, but by becoming *erroneous* or *ungodly*, its not worth our labour to word it with ſuch men. Pride and Malice hearken not to Reaſon: Apologies will not cure the envy of a *Cain*, or the pride of a *Diotrephes*, or the hypocriſie and perſecuting fury of a Phariſee. But (as *Auguſt.*) *Conſcientiam malam laudantis præconium non ſanat; nec bonam vulnerat convitium.*] *Praiſe* healeth not an *ill Conſcience*; and *reproach* cannot wound *a good one.* Conſcience reſpects a higher tribunal. Could a Calumniator *be believed*, it were a ſmall thing to be judged by man: and

Conſcia mens recti famæ mendacia ridet.

But when they make themſelves the objects of the common compaſſion or deriſion, they ſpare me the labour of a confutation: Its enough to ſay with the Philoſopher, [*Ego ſic vivam, ut nemo illi credat*] [I will ſo *live*, that no man ſhall believe him;] when they themſelves will ſo *lie* that no man (or next to none) ſhall believe them. Its a far more neceſſary and profitable employment, to oppoſe our *ſins* then our *accuſers*; and to ſee that we *are blameleſs*, then that we *are ſo reputed*: and to eſcape the *temptations of Satan*, rather then the *calumnies of his inſtruments*. Its better this *wind* offend our *ears*, then *guilt* ſhould wound our *hearts*. *Penalty* is heavier then injurious *perſecution*, becauſe of its *relation* to *guilt*: but *culpability* it ſelf is worſe then both.

Pœna poteſt demi, culpa perennis erit.
Mors faciet certe, ne ſim, cum venerit, exul.
Ne non peccarem, mors quoq; non faciet.

And even when God hath fully pardoned us,

us, *Litura tamen extat.* A ſoul that knows the evil of ſin, and ſeeth by faith the dreadfull Majeſty, and the judgement to which he muſt ſtand or fall, is taken up with greater cares, then the defence of his reputation with men; except as Gods honour, or the good of ſouls may be concerned in it.

Another thing that encouraged me to this engagement was, that my Antagoniſt ſeemed exceeding deſirous of a cloſe ſyllogiſtical way of arguing, which put me in hope of a ſpeedier and better iſſue, then with wordy wandring Sophiſters I could expect. I never liked, either the feaſts that conſiſt of ſawce and ceremony with little meat; or the bawling rooks, that will not receive a bit without a troubleſome noiſe.

Sed tacitus paſci ſi poſſet corvus, haberet
Plus dapis, & rixa multo minus, invidiaq;

Nor the prodigal covetouſneſs that turns the Cock when none requireth it; and plucks up the flood-gates, and ſets the mill a going when there is no griſt; *& omnia vult dicere, & nihil audire.*

When words are too cheap, it either proves them

them worthleſs, or makes them ſo eſteemed. The *ſentence* of an *Orator*, and the *very ſyllables* of a *Diſputant* ſhould be ſhort. There ſhould be no more *diſhes* then are neceſſary for the *meat*: nor no more ſtraw then is neceſſary to ſuſtain the grain. Frugality of ſpeech, and *ſermonem habere rebus parem*, do *ſhew* and *make* our ſpeeches valuable. Truth would be adorned, but not covered: attended, but not crowded; proclaimed, but not buried in an heap of words. Arguments are like money, that is valuable according to the mettal and the weight, and not according to the number of pieces, or curioſity of the ſtamp.

And a third thing that made me the willinger to this task, was; that the aſſaults of Juglers, that thought to catch me under the names and mask of *Seekers*, *Behmeniſts*, and ſuch other ſects, had poſſeſſed me with ſo much indignation and diſtaſte, that I was glad to meet with a bare-fac't Papiſt, that was not aſhamed of his Religion, but would profeſs himſelf to be what he is. I could never hear that the Papiſts won ſo many, and ſo conſiderable perſons this threeſcore years, by open dealing, as I have cauſe to think they have won by fraud under the vizor of Seekers, and Sectaries,

Sectaries, within a few years paſt. I fear no Papiſts, but Proteſtant Papiſts, that come to Church, and take the oaths of Supremacy and Allegiance, as many did the engagement but a while ago; or that wear ſome other vizor of diſſimulation. Hypocriſie is nowhere ſo odious as in Religion, where men have to do with a heart ſearching God, and deal in matters of everlaſting conſequence. He hath no Religion, that thinks it his duty to *lie* for his Religion. For he hath no Religion that believeth not in God. And he that believeth him to be a Lover of Lies, believeth not that he is God. *Verba (inq. Auguſt.) propterea inſtituta ſunt, non ut per ea ſe invicem homines fallant, ſed ut eis quiſque in alterius noticiam cogitationes ſuas proferat.*] *Verbis ergo uti ad fallaciam, non ad quod ſunt inſtituta, peccatum eſt.* ——— *Longe tamen tolerabilius eſt, in his quæ à religione fidei ſejuncta ſunt mentiri, quam in his, &c.*——] Truth is great, (and the greateſt advantage to a Diſputant:) and will at laſt prevail. Lying is a remedy that needeth a remedy; eaſing for the time by palliation, but much increaſing the diſeaſe. [*Magna eſt vis Veritatis quæ contra omnium ingenia, calliditatem, ſolertiam, contra fictas hominum inſidias,*

insidiæ, facilè se per ipsam defendit, saith *Seneca*.

Three Questions about Popery have put the world to much dispute. Qu. 1. *Whether it be the right and safe Religion?* 2. *Whether it may be tolerated?* 3. *Whether it be our duty to enter into reconciliation and communion with the Papist*, (though not subjection) *and on what terms?*

The first I have debated in this and divers other writings, (viz. *three Disputations*, called *the safe Religion, a Key for Catholikes*, &c. *a winding-sheet for Popery, and the true Catholike, and Catholike Church discribed.*) It is one of the reproaches of humane nature, that ever it could be corrupted into so sensless, unreasonable, impious, uncharitable a thing as Popery: And one of the prodigies of misery, in the world, that any save one that *Inguinis & capitis quæ sunt discrimina nescit*, should be fully, and seriously a Papist.

But four things I find are the pillars of their Church, and propagates their corruptions: 1. One is the love of themselves and of the world in unsanctified hearts: which makes them be of the Religion of their Rulers; and resolve to be of no Religion that shall undo them in the world: And

And therefore to escape reproach, and torment, and death, they will do any thing, and as they speak, will *trust God with their souls, rather then men with their bodies*: The meaning is, they will rather venture on the wrath of God, then of man; and save their bodies, then their souls; and secure this life (as long as they can) then life everlasting.

2. Another is *Custom* and *Education*, possessing men with blinding stupifying prejudice, together with a *contempt* of truth and happiness, that keepeth sluggish souls from that diligent search and tryal that is necessary to a conquest of that temptation, and to a saving entertainment of the truth. And the name and reverence of their forefathers, emboldeneth them against the name and reverence of God. *Adeò à teneris assuescere multum est.* Saith *Seneca*, *Inter causas malorum est quod vivimus ad exempla, nec ratione componimur, sed consuetudine abducimur. Quod si pauci facerent, nolumus imitari; quum plures facere caperunt, quasi honestius sit, quia frequentius sequimur, & recti apud nos locum tenet error, ubi publicus factus est.* Not what *God saith*, but what *man doth*, is made the rule of this humane apish kind of Religion. And so the Tyrant Custom ruleth them: *Et gravissimum est imperium*

imperium conſuetudinis, Senec. *Educatio & diſciplina mores facit: & id ſapit unuſquiſque quod didicit*: Id.

3. Another cauſe is ſuperſtitious fears which the falſe doctrins of *Purgatory*, and *no ſalvation out of their Church*, &c. have caſt into mens minds. The Prieſts rule their ſubjects, as one of their Captains ruled the *Thracians*, by making ladders, and making them believe he would climb up to *Juno* to complain of them.

4. And it is not the leaſt ſupport of Popery, that it maketh light of heynous ſins, as fornication, drunkenneſs, ſwearing, forſwearing, lying, equivocation, *&c.* and provideth for them the eaſie remedies of confeſſion, and ſuch gentle pennance as the ſagacious tractable Prieſt ſhall impoſe. But holy water will not waſh out their ſpots. God judgeth not as the Pope or Maſs Prieſt. *Let no man deceive you with vain words: for ſuch things* (as *fornication, uncleanneſs, filthineſs, fooliſh talking*, &c.) *cometh the wrath of God on the children of diſobedience*, Eph. 5. 3, 5, 6. For all the flatteries of indulgences, and pardons, and the name of *Venial ſin*, yet conſcience hath not pardoned all that is pardoned by the Pope. And,

Prima eſt hæc ultio, quod ſe
Judice nemo nocens abſolvitur ——

And its no great eaſe to have an *external* pardon, and neither an *Eternal*, nor *Internal*; but *Nocte die que ſuum geſtare in pectore teſtem.* How many muſt be damned by Chriſt, that were pardoned by the Vice-chriſt.

Qu. 2. And for the ſecond Queſtion, about the *Toleration of Popery*, let him that deſireth it, but procure a Toleration of the Proteſtant Profeſſion in *Spain, Italy, Bavaria, Auſtria*, &c. and then I undertake to give him a ſatisfactory anſwer of this queſtion. In the mean time, I ſhall only ſay as *Seneca, Nemo ex imprudentibus eſt qui reliquí ſibi debeat*: eſpecially men that renounce all their *ſenſes* and *reaſon*, ſo far, as not to believe that bread is bread, and wine is wine, ſhould not be left without a guardian. But in general, we muſt on one hand avoid inhumane cruelty (and leave *them thoſe* means that are ſuited to their cauſe:) and on the other hand we muſt take heed that we betray not the Goſpel and the ſouls of men, to the ſubtilty and pernitious fraud of trained deceivers. We muſt vigilantly and ſtrenuouſly *defend*, though we muſt tenderly

tenderly and ſparingly *offend*, any further then is neceſſary to ſuch *defence*.

Qu. 3. And for the third queſtion, about *Reconciliation*, I have ſpoken to it, and offered the terms in other writings (eſpecially my *Key for Catholikes*) I only add now, that the *Peace-makers* no doubt *are bleſſed*; *and if it be poſſible, as much as in us lyeth*, we muſt *live peaceably with all men*. But for the *terms*, we cannot poſſibly meet every corrupted party half way in their ſins and errors, that we may be friends. Let us hold to the *immutable ſufficient Rule, indited by the Holy Ghoſt*, and judge of all that ſwerve from it, according to the degree of their deviation, and unite in the ancient ſimplicity of Doctrine, Worſhip, and Government, and lay our unity only on things neceſſary: For whoſoever deviſeth any other Rule and terms of unity then theſe, ſhall never attain it, but raiſe up a new Sect, and encreaſe our wounds. I am as much for unity as ever was *Caſſander*, *Eraſmus*, *Grotius*, or any of the Reconcilers: But I am certain that to ſubſcribe to the *Trent* Decrees and Creed, and to turn Papiſt, or Semi-Papiſt, or participate of any ſin for peace, is not the way. Let ſome plead for all the Greek corruptions, and ſome for the Popes ſupremacy regulated

gulated by Canons; and some for his meer Primacy as *principium unitatis*, and his Government of all the West as Patriark; let them digladiate about a Pope and Council, as wisely as *Greece* and *Troy* did fight ten years for a beautiful whore; I am sure that none of these are the way to the Churches Unity and Peace (as I have opened in my description of the true Catholike Church) Nor will their design be more successful, that would so discordantly agree us all with the first three hundred years, as to deny the first hundred, or two hundred to be our pattern, and to make all the *forms* and *ceremonies* to be necessary to our concord, which the third or fourth Century used but as things indifferent, with diversity and mutation, and mutual forbearance.

But of the terms of *Catholike Unity*, I have spoken, as in the forecited papers, so in a *Pacificatory Letter of the Worcestershire Ministers to Mr.* J. Dury: and if God will, shall do it yet more fully.

And of the evils in Popery, that move me to distast it, having given a *Breviate* in an Epistle before another mans Book, which I perceive *is seen of very few*, I shall here annex so much of that Epistle, as is pertinent to the present business.

Readers,

WEre not the Judgements of God so dreadfull, and infatuation so lamentable in matters of everlasting consequence, and sin so odious, and the calamities of the Church, the dishonour of God, and the Damnation of Souls such deplorable things, as tolerate not a laughter in the standers by, it would seem one of the most ridiculous things in the World, that a man of seeming Wisdom should be a Papist; and that so many Princes, and learned men, with the vulgar multitude, should be able so far to renounce or intoxicate their Reason while they are awake: And a Papist would be described, to be one that sets up his understanding to be the laughing-stock of the sober rational World. There are abundance of Controversies among Physitians that concern mens lives; and yet I have heard of none so vain, as to step forth and challenge the Authority of being the universal Decider of them, or to charge God with folly or oversight, if he have not appointed some such universal Judge in the World, to end all Controversies in matters of such weight. But if in Physick's, Law, or any

of

of the Sciences, the Controverſies ſhould be never ſo many or ſo great, if yet you could reſolve them into ſenſe it ſelf, and bring all to the judgement of mens eyes, and ears, and taſte, and feeling, who would not laugh or hiſs at him that would ſtill make them the matters of ſerious doubts?

The Papiſts *finding that man is* [illegible]*perfect, and knoweth but in part, and that in the Scripture there are* ſome things are hard to be underſtood, *and that Earth hath not ſo much Light as Heaven, imagine that hereby they have a fair advantage to plead for an univerſal terreſtrial Judge, and to reproach God, if he have appointed none ſuch, and next to plead that their* Pope *or his approved* Councils *muſt needs have this Authority. And when they come to the Deciſion, they are not aſhamed to ſee after ſo many hundred years pretentions, that the World is but* baffled *with the empty name of* a Judge of Controverſies, *and that Difficulties are no leſs Difficulties ſtill, and Controverſies are nowhere ſo voluminous as with them. But this is a ſmall matter with them. Their Judge ſeems much wiſer when he is ſilent, then when he ſpeaks. When he comes to a Deciſion, and formeth up thereby the* Hodge-podge *of* Popery, *they ſeem not to ſmile at, nor be aſhamed*

of the Picture which they have drawn, which is, of an Harlot shewing her nakedness, and committing her lewdness in the open Assemblies, in the sight of the Sun. They openly proclaim their shame against the light of all the acknowledged Principles in the World, their own or others, and in opposition to all, or almost all that is commendable among men. The charge seems high, but (in a few words) take the proof.

1. *They confess the Scripture to be the Word of God: and yet when we would appeal to that as the Rule of Faith and Life, or as a divine Revelation, in our Disputes, they fly off, and tell us of its obscurity, and the necessity of a Judge. If they meet with a* Hoc est corpus meum, *they seem for a while to be zealous for the Scripture: But tell them that* Paul *in* 1 Cor. 11. 26, 27, 28. *doth call it* Bread *after the Consecration, no less than three times in the three next Verses, and then Scripture is non-sense to them till the Pope make sense of it. It is one of their principal labours against us, to argue against the Scriptures sufficiency to this use. By no means can we prevail with them to stand to the Decision of the Scripture.*

2. *They excessively cry up the* Church, *and appeal to its Decision: and therefore we might hope,*

hope, that here if anywhere, we might have some hold of them. But when it comes to the Point, they not only disown the judgement of the Church, but impudently call Christ's *Spouse a Strumpet, and cut off (in their uncharitable imagination) two or three parts of the universal* Church *as* Hereticks *or* Schismaticks. *The judgement of the Churches in* Armenia, Ethiopia, Egypt, Syria, *the* Greeks, *and many more besides the* Reformed Churches *in the* West, *is against their* Popes *universal* Vicarship *or* Soveraignty, *and many of their Errours that depend thereon: And yet their judgement is not regarded by this Faction. And if a third or fourth part (such as it is) of the* Universal Church, *may cry up themselves as the Church to be appealed to, and condemn the far greater part, why may not a tenth or a twentieth part do the like? Why may not the* Donatists, *the* Novatians, *or the* Greeks (*much more*) *do so as well as* Papists?

3. *They cry up* Tradition. *And when we ask them, How we shall know it, and where it is to be found, they tell us, principally in the profession and practice of the present Church. And yet when two or three parts of the universal Church profess that Tradition is against the* Papal Monarchy, *and other Points*

depending on it, they cast Tradition behind their backs.

4. *They cry up the* Fathers: *and when we bring their judgements against the ſubſtance of Popery, they ſometime vilifie or accuſe them as erroneous, and ſometime tell us, that Fathers as well as Scripture muſt be no otherwiſe underſtood, than their* Church *expoundeth them.*

5. *They plead for an appeal to* Councils; *and (though we eaſily prove that none of them were univerſal, yet ſuch as they were) they call them all* Reprobate, *which were not approved by their Pope, let the number of Biſhops there be never ſo great. And thoſe that were approved, if they ſpeak againſt them, they reject alſo, either with lying ſhifts denying the approbation, or ſaying, the acts are not* de fide, *or not* conciliariter facta, *or the ſenſe muſt be given by their preſent Church, or one ſuch contemptible ſhift or other.*

6. *At leaſt one would think they ſhould ſtand to the judgement of the Pope, which yet they will not: for ſhame forbids them to own the Doctrine of thoſe Popes that were* Hereticks *or* Infidels *(and by Councils ſo judged:) And others they are forced to diſown, becauſe they contradict their Predeceſſors. And at* Rome *the Cardinals are the Pope, while he*

that

that hath the name is oft made light of. And how infallible he is judged by the French *and the* Venetians; *how* Sixtus *the fifth was valued by the* Spaniards, *and by* Bellarmine, *is commonly known.*

7. *But all this is nothing to their renunciation of* humanity, *even of the* common ſenſes and reaſon of the world. *When the matter is brought to the Deciſion of their eyes, and taſte, and feeling, whether* Bread *be* Bread, *and* Wine *be* Wine; *and yet all* Italy, Spain, Auſtria, Bravaria, &c. *cannot reſolve it; yea, generally (unleſs ſome latent* Proteſtant) *do paſs their judgement againſt their ſenſes, & the ſenſes of all ſound men in the World; & that not in a matter beyond the reach of ſenſe (as whether* Chriſt *be there ſpiritually) but in a matter belonging to ſenſe, if any thing belong to it, as whether* Bread be Bread, &c. *Kings and Nobles, Prelates and Prieſts, do all give their judgement, that all their ſenſes are deceived. And is it poſſible for theſe men then* to know any thing? *or any controverſie between us and them to be decided? If we ſay that the Sun is light, or that the Pope is a man, and Scripture legible, or that there are the Writings of Councils and Fathers extant in the World, they may as well concur in a denyal of all this, or any thing elſe that ſenſe ſhould*

judge of. If they tell us that Scripture requireth them to contradict all their ſenſes in this point; I anſwer,

1. *Not that Scripture before mentioned, that calleth it* [Bread] *after the Conſecration, thrice in the three next Verſes.*

2. *And how know they that there is ſuch a Scripture, if all their ſenſes be ſo fallible? If the certainty of ſenſe be not ſuppoſed, a little learning or Wit might ſatisfie them, that Faith can have no certainty. But is it not a moſt dreadful judgement of God, that Princes and Nations, Learned men, and ſome that in their way are conſcientious, ſhould be given over to ſo much inhumanity, and to make a Religion of this brutiſhneſs, (and worſe) and to perſecute thoſe with Fire and Sword, that are not ſo far forſaken by God, and by their reaſon? and that they ſhould ſo ſolicitouſly labour the perverſion of States and Kingdoms for the promoting of ſtupidity or ſtark madneſs?*

8. *And (if we go from their Principles to their Ends, or Wayes, we ſhall ſoon ſee that) they are alſo againſt the* Unity of the Church, *while they pretend this as their chiefeſt Argugument, to draw men to their way. They ſet up a corrupted Faction, and condemn the far greater part of the* Church; *and will have*

no

no unity with any but those of their own Faction and Subjection: and fix this as an essential part of their Religion, creating thereby an impossibility of universal concord.

9. *They also contradict the Experience of many thousand Saints; asserting that they are all void of the Love of God and saving Grace, till they become subject to the Pope of* Rome; *when as the Souls of these Believers have Experience of the Love of God within them, and feel that Grace that proveth their Justification. I wonder what kind of thing it is that is called Love or Holiness in a Papist, which Protestants and other* Christians *have not, and what is the difference.*

10. *They are most notorious Enemies to Charity, condemning most of the* Christian *world to Hell, for being out of their subjection.*

11. *They are notorious Enemies to Knowledge under pretence of* Obedience *and* Unity, *and avoiding* Heresie. *They celebrate their Worship in a Language not understood by the vulgar Worshippers. They hinder the People from* Reading *the holy* Scriptures, *(which the ancient Fathers exhorted men and women to, as an ordinary thing.) The quality of their Priests and People, testifies this.*

12. *They oppose the* Purity *of* divine Worship, *setting up a multitude of humane Inventions*

ventions instead thereof, and idolatrously (for no less can be said of it) adoring a piece of consecrated Bread *as their God.*

13. *They are Opposers of* Holiness, *both by the foresaid enmity to Knowledge, Charity, and purity of Worship, and by many unholy Doctrines, and by deluding Souls with an outside histrionicall way of Religion, never required by the Lord, consisting in a multitude of* Ceremonies, *and worshipping of Angels, and the Souls of Saints, and Images, and Crosses,* &c. *Let experience speak how much the Life of Holiness is promoted by them.*

14. *They are Enemies to common* Honesty, *teaching the Doctrines of Equivocations and Mental Reservations, and making many hainous sins venial, and many of the most odious sins to be Duties, as killing Kings that are excommunicated by the Pope, taking Oaths with the foresaid Reservations, and breaking them,* &c. *For the* Jesuits *Doctrine,* Montaltus *the* Jansenist, *and many of the* French *Clergy have pretty well opened it: And the Pope himself hath lately been fain to publish a condemnation of their* Apology. *And yet the power and interest of the* Jesuites *and their followers among them, is not altogether unknown to the World.*

15. *They are Enemies to* Civil Peace *and* Government,

Government, *(if there be any such in the World) as their Doctrine and Practice of killing and deposing excommunicate Princes, breaking Oaths,* &c. *shews.* Bellarmine *that will go a middle way, gives the Pope power* in ordine ad spiritualia, *and indirectly, to dispose of Kingdoms, and tells us, that it is unlawfull to tolerate Heretical Kings that propagate their* Heresie, *(that is, the ancient Faith.) How well Doctor* Heylin *hath vindicated their* Council *of* Laterane *in this, (whose* Decrees *stand as a Monument of the horrid treasonable Doctrine of the Papists) I shall, if God will, hereafter manifest: In the mean time, let any man read the words of the Council, and judge.*

And now whether a Religion that is at such open enmity with 1. *Scripture,* 2. *The Church,* 3. *Tradition,* 4. *Fathers,* 5. *Councils,* 6. *Some Popes,* 7. *The common senses and Reason of all the World, even their own,* 8. *Unity of* Christians, 9. *Knowledge,* 10. *Experience of Believers,* 11. *Charity,* 12. *Purity of Worship,* 13. *Holiness,* 14. *Common Honesty,* 15. *and to Civil Government and Peace (which might all easily be fully proved, though here but touched) I say, whether such a Religion should be embraced and advanced with such diligence and violence, and mens souls laid upon*

upon it, is the controverſie before us. And whether it ſhould be tolerated (even the propagation of it, to the damnation of the peoples ſouls) is now the Queſtion which the juggling Papiſts *have ſet a foot among thoſe that have made themſelves our Rulers: and there are found men among us, that call themſelves* Proteſtants *and godly, that plead for the ſaid Toleration; (and conſequently for the delivering up of theſe Nations to Popery, if not to* Spaniſh, *or other forreign Powers) which if they effect, and after their contrary Profeſſions, prove ſuch Traitors to* Chriſt, *his Goſpel and their poſterity, as they leave the Land of their Nativity in miſery, they ſhall leave their ſtinking names for a reproach and curſe to future Generations; and on ſuch Pillars ſhall be written,* [This pride, ſelf-ſeeking, uncharitableneſs, and ſchiſm hath done.]

28 MR 59

This was written and printed under the late Uſurpers.)

Poſtſcript.

Poſtſcript.

Reader,

THough the Papiſts have ſeemed to be the moſt diſcountenanced party under the late Uſurpers, and to have no intereſt or power, yet I have ſtill found, that thoſe ſped worſt from men, that were moſt againſt them; and that I never wrote any book againſt them, but it brought a ſharper ſtorm upon me, then any thing that I wrote againſt any other Sect that was more viſibly in power. And yet it was not openly profeſſed to be for my oppoſition to Popery, but on ſome other account: and though the fountain by the taſte of the waters, might be known, yet it ſelf and ſecret conducts were all underground and undiſcernable. The Jeſuits that are the ſpring of theſe and greater things then theſe, are latent, and their motion is not ſeen, while we ſee the motions which are cauſed by their ſecret force. So that by this means its only thoſe few inquiſitive diſcerning perſons, that can ſee a cauſe in its effect, that find them out: and thoſe few are unable to make full proof, even of the things they know; and thereby

are

are prohibited from appearing openly in the cauſe, leſt coming ſhort in legal proof, they leave the guilty triumphing over the innocent as calumniators. For the laſt book that I wrote againſt them (*My Key for Catholikes*) the Parliament-houſe it ſelf, and all the land did ring of my accuſations; and the menaces were ſo high, that my intended ruine was the common talk. And I know their indignation is not abated. My crime is, that their zeal to proſelyte me, hath acquainted me with ſome of their ſecrets, and let me know what the Jeſuits are doing, and how great a party that are masked under the name of *Seekers*, *Familiſts*, &c. they have in the land. I have therefore Reader, this double requeſt to thee: Firſt, arm thy ſelf diligently againſt Popery, if thou would'ſt preſerve thy Religion and thy ſoul. Whatever Sects aſſault thee openly, ſuſpect and avoid the diſeaſe that is endeavouring with greateſt advantages to be Epidemical. To this end, be well ſtudied in the writings that have opened their vanity and ſhame: I hope, what I have written on that ſubject, will not be uſeleſs to them that are not at leiſure to read the larger volumes. Read Dr. *Challoners Credo ſanctam Eccleſiam Catholicam*. *Peter Moulins* Anſwer to *Cottons* Queſtions.

Queſtions. And for larger Volumes, *Uſher*, *Chillingworth*, *Field*, *Whittakers*, eſpecially *de Pontif. Roman.* may be numbered with the moſt ſolid, judicious and uſeful: And Dr. *Mouline* of the Novelty of Popery now in the preſs, with *Rivet*, and *Chamier*, to add no more.

And if ever thou fall in company with *Seekers*, or *Familiſts*, that are queſtioning all things, and endeavouring to diſparage the holy Scriptures, and the Miniſtry, and Church, and Ordinances, though but in a queſtioning way, look then to thy Religion, and ſuſpect a Papiſt: Secondly, becauſe experience hath taught me to expect that my renewed aſſault of Popery ſhould raiſe ſome ſtorm, and renew my dangers, (though I know not which way it will come, and expect it ſhould be upon pretence of ſomething that is no kin to the real cauſe,) let him that hath been ſo exceedingly beholden to the ſervants of Chriſt for prayers, have thy prayers in particular for this, that he may be ſatisfied in Gods approbation, and count it a ſmall matter to be cenſured by man, or to ſuffer thoſe ſoft and harmleſs ſtroaks, that the impotent arm of fleſh can inflict; and may live and dye in the Army of believers, deſcribed *Heb.* 11, and 12.

and

and be so far preserved from the contrivances of malice, as is needful to his appointed work: in which it is the top of his ambition to be found

A faithful though unworthy servant of Christ for his Church,

Sep. 3. 1660.

Rich. Baxter.

28 MR 59

The

The CONTENTS.

The first Part.

Mr. Johnsons *Argument prosecuted, to* pag. 6
My Answer. 7 to 26
Mr. Johnsons *second Paper.* 27
His attempt to prove the succession of the Roman *Soveraignty.* 49 to the end.
My letter to the sender of his. 68
My Reply to the second Paper. 77
On which of us the Proof is incumbent. 87
Of the Eastern and Southern Churches. 94, 95, &c.
Whether we are one Church with them of Rome. 107, &c.
Of our separation. 107
Whether the Armenians, Ethiopians, Syrians, *&c. are excluded as Hereticks?* 113
The instance of an Appeal of John *of* Antioch *refuted.* 127

The instance of Flavianus *Appeal refuted.* 129
Of Leo's *pretended restoring* Theodoret *upon Appeal.* 132
Of Cyprians *desire that* Stephen *would depose* Martian *Bishop of* Arles. 133
A pretended Decree of the Council of Sardis *examined.* 135
Basils *words Epist.* 74. *examined.* 138
Chrysostoms *words to* Innocent. 140
A pretended Proof from the Council of Ephesus *confuted.* 141
Of the addresses to Pope Julius *by* Athanasius *and the* Arrians. 143
Chamiers *words hereabout.* 146
Of Chrysostoms *case.* 147
Of Theodosius *and the Concil. Ephes.* 152
Of the Council of Calcedon. 154
Of Pope Agapet *deposing* Anthymius *of* Constantinople. 159
Of Gregories *words.* 160
Of Cyril *and* Celestine *against* Nestorius. 161
Of Juvenals *words.* 163
Of Valentinians *and* Theodosius *words.* 164
Of Vincentius Lirinensis *words.* 169

Of

The Contents.

Of Philip *and* Arcadius *at Concil.* Epheſus. 170
The nullity of all theſe pretended Proofs. 174
Whether Papiſts give, and Popes accept the Title of Vice-Chriſt, Monarch, &c. 175 to 188
Of the Conteſt of Councils for the Rule. 188
Mr. Johnſons *work to which his cauſe engageth him.* 191

The Contents of the ſecond Part.

Qu. *WHether the Church of which the Proteſtants are members have been viſible ever ſince the daies of Chriſt on earth?* Aff.
The Church *what.* 197
Proteſtants *what.* 198
Of Membership, *and* Viſibility. 201
The firſt Argument, to prove the ſucceſſive Viſibility. 204
The ſecond Argument. 209
Papiſts Teſtimonies for the ſufficiency of Scripture as the Rule. 219

Some of the Fathers of the same. 221
Where was our Church. 225
The true Catholike Church, how described by Augustine. 227
Optatus. 231
Tertullian. 232
The third Argument. 238
The fourth Argument. 241, 242
Arguments proving the Visibility of a Church without the Papacy, since Christ. Argument first, from the Councel of Calcedon. 242
Argument 2. *From the silence of the Ancients in cases where the allegation of the Papal power would have been most pertinent and necessary.* 244
Argument 3. *From the Tradition and Testimony of the greatest part of the Church.* 248
Argument 4. *From the Churches without the verge of the Empire, not subject to the Pope.* 249
Argument 5. *From the Eastern Churches within the Empire, not subjects of the Pope.* 251
Argument 6. *From the full Testimony of* Gregory *the first,* p. 252, &c. *defended against* Bellarmine.

Argument

Argument 7. *From the Confession of chief Papists.* Æneas Sylvius, Melchior Canus, Reynerius. 267
Argument 8. *From Historical Testimony about the Original of Universal Headship.* 269
Argument 9. *The generality of Christians in the first ages, and most in the latter, free from owning the Papacy.* 271
Argument 10. *Most Christians in all ages ignorant of Popery.* 275
Object. *The* Armenians, Greeks, *&c. differ from Protestants: Answered.* 280
Miscellany considerable Testimonies. 288
Mr. Johnsons *exception.* 292
My Answer to his exception, shewing in what sense Hereticks are, *or* are not *in the Church, applyed to the Eastern and Southern Churches.* 293, &c.
Mr. Johnsons *Explication of the most used terms, with my Quere's thereupon, and his Answer, and my Reply.* 1. *Of the Church.* 311
2. *Of Heresie.* 324, &c.
3. *Of the Pope.* 330, &c.
4. *Of Bishops.* 337
5. *Of Tradition.* 342
Of General Councils. 345

6. *Of*

6. *Of Schism.* 350
An Appendix about Successive Ordination. 355
Letters between me and T. S. *a Papist; with a Narrative of the success, written by his friend.* 363

28 MR 59

28 MR 59

ERRATA.

PAge 176. l. 24. for *it* r. *that*. p. 179. l. 14. r. *Freheri*. p. 217. l. 26. r. *neceſſitate*. p. 271. l. 6. r. *Eccleſiæ Romanæ*. p. 355. l. 2. for *here* r. *bear*.

Mr. *Johnſons* firſt PAPER.

THE *Church of Chriſt, wherein only Salvation is to be had, never was nor is any other then thoſe Aſſemblies of Chriſtians who were united in communion and obedience to S.* Peter *in the beginning ſince the Aſcenſion of Chriſt. And ever ſince to his lawful ſucceſſors, the Biſhops of* Rome, *as to their chief Paſtor.*

Proof.

Whatſoever Congregation of Chriſtians is *now* the true Church of Chriſt, acknowledges S. *Peter* and his lawful ſucceſſors the Biſhops of *Rome*, ever ſince the Aſcenſion of Chriſt to have been; and *now* to be by the Inſtitution of Chriſt, their chief Head

P. B. 34.

ERRATA.

PAge 176. l. 24. for *it* r. *that*. p. 179. l. 14. r. *Freberi*. p. 217. l. 26. r. *neceſſitate*. p. 271. l. 6. r. *Eccleſia Romana*. p. 355. l. 2. for *here* r. *bear*.

Mr. *Johnsons* first PAPER.

THE *Church of Christ, wherein only Salvation is to be had, never was nor is any other then thoſe Aſſemblies of Chriſtians who were united in communion and obedience to S.* Peter *in the beginning ſince the Aſcenſion of Chriſt. And ever ſince to his lawful ſucceſſors, the Biſhops of* Rome, *as to their chief Paſtor.*

Proof.

Whatſoever Congregation of Chriſtians is *now* the true Church of Chriſt, acknowledges S. *Peter* and his lawful ſucceſſors the Biſhops of *Rome*, ever ſince the Aſcenſion of Chriſt to have been; and *now* to be by the Inſtitution of Chriſt, their chief Head

Head and Governour on earth in matters belonging to the ſoul next under Chriſt.

But there is no ſalvation to be had out of that Congregation of Chriſtians, which is *now* the true Church of Chriſt.

Ergo, there is no ſalvation to be had out of that Congregation of Chriſtians which acknowledges S. *Peter* and his lawful ſucceſſors the Biſhops of *Rome* ever to have been ſince the Aſcenſion of Chriſt; and *now* to be by the Inſtitution of Chriſt their chief Head and Governour on earth in matters belonging to the ſoul next under Chriſt.

The Minor is clear; For all Chriſtians agree in this, that to be ſaved, it is neceſſary to be in the true Church of Chriſt; that only being his myſtical Body, Spouſe and Mother of the faithful, to which muſt belong all thoſe who ever have been, are, or ſhall be ſaved.

The Major I prove thus.

Whatſoever Congregation of Chriſtians is *now* the true Church of Chriſt, hath been alwaies viſible ſince the time of Chriſt, either under perſecution, or in peace and flouriſhing.

But no Congregation of Chriſtians hath been alwaies viſible ſince the time of Chriſt, either

either under perſecution or in peace and flouriſhing, ſave that only which acknowledges S. *Peter* and his lawful ſucceſſors the Biſhops of *Rome*, ever to have been ſince the Aſcenſion of Chriſt; and *now* to be by Chriſts Inſtitution, their chief Head and Governour on earth, in matters belonging to the ſoul next under Chriſt.

Ergo, whatſoever Congregation of Chriſtians is *now* the true Church of Chriſt, acknowledges St. *Peter*, and his lawful ſucceſſors the Biſhops of *Rome*, ever to have been ſince the Aſcenſion of Chriſt; and *now* to be by Chriſts Inſtitution their chief Head and Governour on earth, in matters belonging to the ſoul, next under Chriſt.

The Major is proved thus.

Whatſoever Congregation of Chriſtians hath alwaies had viſible Paſtors and People united, hath alwaies been viſible, either under perſecution, or in peace and flouriſhing.

But whatſoever Congregation of Chriſtians is *now* the true Church of Chriſt, hath alwaies had viſible Paſtors and People *united*.

Ergo, whatſoever Congregation of Chriſtians is *now* the true Church of Chriſt, hath alwaies been viſible, either under perſecution,

ſecution, or in peace and flouriſhing.

The Major of this laſt Sylogiſm is evident, for ſeeing a viſible Church is nothing but a viſible Paſtor and people *united*: where there have alwaies been viſible Paſtors and people *united*, there hath alwaies been a viſible Church.

The Minor I prove from *Epheſians*, cap. 4. ver. 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, *&c.*

Where S. *Paul* ſaies, that Chriſt had Inſtituted, that there ſhould be Paſtors and Teachers in the Church for the work of the Miniſtry, and preſerving the people under their reſpective charges from being carried away with every wind of doctrine, *&c.* which evidently ſhews, thoſe Paſtors muſt be viſible, ſeeing the work of the Miniſtry, which Preaching, and Adminiſtration of Sacraments, and Governing their flocks, are all external and *viſible* actions. And this ſhews likewiſe, that thoſe Paſtors and People muſt be *alwaies viſible*, becauſe they are to continue from Chriſts Aſcenſion, untill we all meet together in the unity of faith, *&c.* which cannot be before the day of judgement.

Neither can it be ſaid (as ſome ſay) that this promiſe of Chriſt is only conditional, ſince to put it to be ſo without evident Reaſon,

Reaſon, giveth ſcope to every one at his pleaſure, to make every other promiſe of Chriſt to be conditional. And ſo we ſhall be certain of nothing that Chriſt hath promiſed, neither that ſhall alwaies be a viſible or inviſible Church, nor any Church at all; no nor of Judgement, nor of Eternal life, or of the Reſurrection of the dead, *&c.* for one may ſay with as much ground, as this is ſaid, that ſome conditions were included in all thoſe promiſes, which being not fulfilled, hinders the execution of them.

There remains only, to prove the Minor of the ſecond Sylogiſm, *viz.* That no Congregation of Chriſtians hath been alwaies viſible, *&c.* ſave that which acknowledges S. *Peter*, and his lawful ſucceſſors, *&c.* to be their chief Head and Governour, *&c.* next under Chriſt.

This Minor I prove, by obliging the anſwerers to nominate any Congregation of Chriſtians, which alwaies till this preſent time, ſince Chriſt, hath been *viſible*, either under perſecution, or in peace and flouriſhing, ſave that only which acknowledges S. *Peter*, &c. *ut ſupra.*

Sir,

To comply with your deſires of brevity, and of confining my ſelf to half a ſheet of

paper; I ſend you at preſent only one Argument, which being fully diſcuſſed, ſhall be followed by others God willing. To this as to all the reſt of my Arguments, which may hereafter be urged: I require a Categorical and ſtrict Sylogiſtical Anſwer in Form, by Concedo, Nego, Diſtinguo, Omitto, Tranſeat. *And the particular Propoſitions ſpecified, to which the Reſpondents apply any of them; and no more then preciſely this, neither adding Amplifications, Reaſons, Proofs,* &c. *of their own out of form, and that this may be done with all convenient ſpeed. To the place of Scripture,* Epheſ. 4. &c. *is alſo required a Categorical anſwer, to what is preciſely preſſed in it, without directing the diſcourſe to other things: And what is anſwered otherwiſe, I ſhall not eſteem an anſwer, but an* Effugium, *or declining of the difficulty. By this method exactly obſerved, Truth will eaſily and ſpeedily be made manifeſt; and your deſires of Brevity will be punctually complied with. I alſo deſire, that the Reſpondent or Reſpondents will (as I do to this) ſubſcribe his, or their name or names to their anſwers, ſo often as any are by him or them returned, with the day of the month when returned.*

William Johnſon.

Decem. 9. 1658

The

The Answer to the first PAPER.

I received yours, and writ this Answer, Jan. 4. 1658.

Sir,

WHoever you are, a serious debate with so sober a Disputant, is to me an exceeding acceptable employment: I shall not, I hope, give you any cause to say, that I decline any difficulties, or balk your strength, or transgress the part of a Respondent. But because, 1. You have not (as you ought to have done) explained the terms of your Thesis. 2. And have made your Propositions so long. 3. And have so cunningly lapped up your fallacies; your Respondent is necessitated to be the larger in distinction and explication. And seeing you are so instant with me for strictness, you thereby oblige your self, if you will be ingenuous, to make only the learned, and not any ignorant

men the Judges of our dispute: because you know that to the unlearned a bare Nego *signifieth nothing; but when such have read your Arguments at length, they will expect as plain and large a confutation, or judge you to be in the right for speaking most.*

TO your Argument. 1. Your conclusion containeth not your Thesis, or Question. And so you give up your cause the first step, and make a new one. It should have contained your Question in terms, and it doth not so much as contain it in the plain sense: so much difference is there between [Assemblies of Christians united, *&c.*] and [Congregation of Christians] and between [Salvation or the Church, never was in any other then those Assemblies] and [no Salvation out of that Congregation]; as I shall shew you: besides other differences which you may see.

Ad Majorem. Resp. 1. By [Congregation] you mean, either the whole Catholike Church united in Christ, or some particular Congregation, which is but part of that whole. In the latter sense, your Subject hath a false supposition, *viz.* that a part is the whole, and your Minor will be false.

And

And your [whatsoever Congregation of Christians] seems to distinguish that from some other excluded Congregation of Christians that is not part of the Catholike Church, which is a supposing the chief part of the Question granted you, which we deny. We know no universal Congregation of Christians but one, which containeth all particular Congregations and Christians, that univocally deserve that name.

2. Either you mean that [this whole Congregation or true Church acknowledgeth] the Popes Soveraignty, or else [that some part of it doth acknowledge it.] The former I deny, and challenge any man living to prove: If it be [part only] that you mean, then either [the greater part] or [the lesser]: that it is the greater, I as confidently almost deny: for it is against the common knowledge of men acquainted with the world, *&c.* If you mean [the lesser part] you shall see anon that it destroys your cause.

3. Either you speak *de Ecclesia qua talis*, or *de Ecclesia qua talis*: and mean that this [acknowledgement] is essential to it, or at least an inseparable property, or else that it is a separable accident. The latter will do you no good: the former I deny. In

summ:

ſumm: I grant that a ſmall corrupt part of the Catholike Church doth *now* acknowledge the Pope to be Chriſts Vicar, (or the Vice-chriſt); but I deny, 1. That the whole doth ſo (which is your great cauſe.) 2. Or the major part. 3. Or any Congregation through all ages (though if they had, it would do you no good.) 4. Or that it is done by any upon juſt ground, but is their corruption.

Ad minorem. Reſp. 1. If you mean any [part] of the Univerſal Church by [that Congregation which is now the true Church] I deny your Minor: If [the whole] I grant it. 2. You ſay [all Chriſtians agree] in it, *&c. Reſp.* I think all Proteſtants, or near all, do: but *Franciſcus à ſancta Clara* hath copiouſly told us (in *Artic. Anglic.*) that moſt of your own Doctors are for the ſalvation of Infidels; and then either you take Infidels for your Church members, or your Doctors for no Chriſtians, or you play not fair play to tell us ſo groſs an untruth, that *all Chriſtians* are agreed in it.

To your concluſion. *Reſp.* 1. Either you mean that [there is no Salvation to be had out of that Univerſal Church, whoſe part (a minor corrupt part) acknowledgeth the Popes

Popes Soveraignty] or else [that there is no Salvation to be had out of that Universal Church which wholly acknowledgeth it] or else [that there is no Salvation to be had out of that part of the Universal Church which acknowledgeth it.] In the first sense I grant your conclusion (if really you are part of the Church.) There is no Salvation to be had out of Christs Universal Church, of which you are a small corrupted part. In the second sense I told you we deny the supposition in the subject. In the third sense I deny the sequel; *non sequitur*, because your Major Proposition being false *de Ecclesia universali*, the conclusion must be false *de parte ista*, as excluding the rest.

But to the unskilful or unwary reader your conclusion seemeth to import, that [the being in such a Church which acknowledgeth the Popes Soveraignty, as it is such a Church, is necessary to Salvation] and so [that the persons acknowledgement is necessary.] But it is a *fallacia accidentis* cunningly lapt up, that is the life of your imported cause. That part of the Universal Church doth hold to the Popes Soveraignty, is *per accidens*; and could you prove that the whole Church doth so (which you are unlike to do) I would say the like. And

that

that your fallacy may the better appear; I give you some examples of such like sophisms.

[Whatsoever Nation is the true Kingdom of *Spain* is proud and cruel against Protestants: But there is no protection there due to any that are not of that Kingdom: therefore there is no protection due to any that are not proud and cruel.] Or [whatsoever Nation is the true Kingdom of *France* acknowledgeth the Pope: but no protection is due from the Governours to any that are not of that Kingdom: therefore no protection is due to any that acknowledge not the Pope.] Or [what ever Nation is the Kingdom of *Ireland* in the daies of Queen *Elizabeth*, was for the Earl of *Tyrone*: but there was no right of Inheritance for any that were not of that Nation: therefore there was no right of Inheritance for any that was not for the Earl of *Tyrone*.] Or suppose that you could have proved it of all the Church. If you had lived four hundred years after Christ, you might as well have argued thus. [Whatsoever Congregation of Christians is *now* the true Church of Christ, is against kneeling in Adoration on the Lords daies. But there is no Salvation to be had out of that

that Congregation of Christians, which is now the true Church of Christ: therefore there is no Salvation to be had out of that Congregation which is against kneeling on the Lords day, *&c.*] But yet, 1. There was Salvation to be had *in* that *Congregation* without being of that opinion. 2. And there is now Salvation to be had in a Congregation that is not of that opinion, as you will confess.

Or [whatsoever Congregation of Christians is *now* the true Church of Christ, doth hold the Canticles and the Epistle to *Philemon* to be Canonical Scripture, (and so have done, *&c.*) But there is no Salvation to be had out of the true Church: therefore there is no Salvation to be had out of that Congregation which holdeth the Canticles and Epistle to *Philemon* to be Canonical Scripture.] But yet, 1. Salvation is to be had in that Church without holding it. 2. And its possible hereafter a Church may deny those two books, and yet you will think Salvation not thereby overthrown. This is but to shew your fallacy from a *corrupt accident*, and indeed but of a part of the Church, and a small part.

Now to your proof of the Major. *Resp. ad Major.* The present *matter* of the Church

Church was not visible in the last Generation, for we were not then born: but the same form of the Church was then existent in a visible *Matter*, and their Profession was visible or audible, though their faith it self was invisible. I will do more then you shall do, in maintaining the constant visibility of the Church.

Ad minorem. 1. If you mean that no Congregation hath been alwaies visible [but that Universal Church whose lesser corrupt part acknowledges] the Popes Soveraignty, I grant it. For besides [the whole containing all Christians as the parts] there can be no other. If you mean [save that part which acknowledgeth] you contradict your self, because a part implyeth other parts. If you mean [save that Universal Church, all whose members (or the most) acknowledge it], there is no such subject existent. 2. I distinguish of *Visibility*: Its one thing to be a visible Church, that is, visible in its essentials; and another thing to be visible *quoad hoc*, as to some separable accident. [The Universal Church] was ever visible; because their Profession of Christiamty was so, and the persons professing: But [the acknowledgement of the Vice-christ] was not alwaies visible, no not

in

in any part, much leſs in the whole. And if it had, it was but a ſeparable accident (if your diſeaſe be not incurable) that was viſible: and therefore, 1. It was not neceſſary to Salvation, nor a proper mark of the Church. 2. Nor can it be ſo for the time to come.

I need to ſay no more to your concluſion. Your Argument is no better then this, [whatſoever Congregation of Chriſtians is *now* the true Church of Chriſt, hath been alwaies viſible ſince the time of Chriſt: But no Congregation of Chriſtians hath been ſo viſible, ſave only that which condemneth the Greeks, which hath a Colledge of Cardinals to chooſe the Popes, which denieth the cup to the laity, which forbideth the reading of Scripture in a known tongue without licenſe, *&c.* Therefore whatſoever Congregation of Chriſtians is now the true Church of Chriſt, hath all theſe]; 1. In a corrupt part it hath. 2. But it had not alwaies. 3. And may be cured hereafter.

To your proof of the Major: 1. I grant your Major.

2. *Ad minorem.* 1. Either you mean [Univerſal Paſtors] each one, or ſome one having charge and Government of the [whole

[whole Church,] or you mean, [unfixed Paſtors having an indefinite charge of Preaching and Guiding when they come and have particular calls and opportunities] or you mean [the fixed Paſtors of particular Churches] In the firſt ſenſe your Minor is falſe, the Catholike Church was never ſo united to any Univerſal Head but Chriſt: no one of the Apoſtles governed the reſt & the whole Church, much leſs any ſince their time. In the ſecond ſenſe, I grant that the Church hath ever had Paſtors ſince the Aſcenſion. In the third ſenſe, I grant that ſome parts or other of the Catholike Church, have ever had fixed Paſtors of Congregations ſince the firſt ſettling of ſuch Paſtors. But any one particular Congregation may ceaſe to have ſuch Paſtors, and may ceaſe it ſelf: and *Rome* hath been long without any true Paſtors; and therefore was then no ſuch viſible Church.

2. If by [Congregation] you mean not the Univerſal Church, but [a part], or if you mean it of [all the parts of the Univerſal Church] I deny your Minor: Communities of Chriſtians, and particular perſons have been and may be without any Paſtors, to whom they are united or ſubject. The Indians that died in the faith while *Frumentius*

tius and *Edesius* were there preaching, before they had any Pastor, were yet Christians and saved: If a Lay-man Convert one, or a thousand, (and you will say that he may baptize them) and they die before they can have a Pastor, or ever hear of any to whom they owe subjection, they are nevertheless saved, as members of the Church; And if all the Pastors in a Nation were murdered or banished, the people would not cease to be Christians and members of the Church. Much less if the Pope were dead or deposed, or a vacancy befell his seat, would all the Catholike Church be annihilated, or cease.

To your Confirmation of the Major [that a visible Church is nothing but a Visible Pastor, and people united] I answer: 1. Its true of the universal Church, as united in Christ, the great Pastor, but not as united in a Vice-Christ or humane head. 2. It is true of a particular Political or organized Church, as united to their proper Pastors 3. But it is not true of every Community of Christians who are a part of the Universal Church. A company converted to Christ, are members of the Universal Church, (though they never heard of a Pope at Rome) before

they are United to Pastors of their own.

The Proof of the Minor from *Eph.* 4. I grant as aforesaid: The text proveth that Pastors the Church shall have: I disclaim the vain objection [of Conditionality in the promise] which you mention. But it proves not, 1. That the Church shall have an Universal Monarch or Vice-Christ, under Christ. 2. Nor that every member of the Universal Church, shall certainly be a member of a particular Church, or ever see the face of a Pastor, or be subject to him.

You say next [There remains only to prove the Minor of the second Syllogism, *viz.* that no Congregation of Christians hath been alwaies visible but that which acknowledges, *&c.*] This is the great point which all lyeth on: The rest hath been all nothing, but a cunning shooing horn to this. Prove this, and prove all: Prove not this, and you have lost your time.

You say [The Minor I prove, by obliging the answerers to nominate any Congregation of Christians which alwaies till this present time since Christ hath been visible —— save that only which acknowledges *&c.*] And have I waited all this while

while for this? You prove it by obliging me to prove the contrary. Ridiculous! *sed quo jure?* 1. Your undertaken form of arguing obligeth you to prove your Minor: You cannot cast your Respondent upon proving and so arguing, and doing the Opponents part. 2. And in your Postscript you presently forbid it me; You require me to hold to a *Concedo*, *Nego*, *Distinguo*, *Omitto*, *Transeat*; threatning that else you will take it for an *Effugium*. And I pray you tell me in your next, to which of these doth the nomination or proof of such a Church as you describe belong? Plainly, you first slip away when you should prove your Minor, and then oblige me to prove the Contrary, and then tell me, if I attempt it, you'l take it for an *Effugium*. A good cause needs not such dealing as this: which me thinks you should be loth a learned man should hear of. 3. Your interest also in the *Matter* (as well as your office as Opponent) doth oblige you to the proof. For though you make a Negative of it, you may put it in other terms at your pleasure. It is your main work to prove [that All the members of the Universal Church have in all ages held the Popes Soveraignty or Universal Head-ship.] Or [the whole Visible

Church hath held it] Prove this, and I will be a Papiſt; you have my promiſe. You affirm, and you muſt prove. Prove a Catholike Church, at leaſt that in the Major part was of that mind: (though that would be nothing to prove the condemnation of the reſt.) If you are an impartial enquirer after truth, fly not when you come to the ſetting too. I give you this further evident reaſon why you cannot oblige me to what you here impoſe; 1. Becauſe you require me to prove the Viſibility of a Church which *held not* your point of Papacy; and ſo put an unreaſonable task upon me, about a *Negative:* or elſe, I muſt prove that they held the contrary, before your opinion was ſtarted: And it is the Catholike Church that we are diſputing about; ſo that I muſt prove this *Negative* of the Catholike Church. 2. It is you that lay the great ſtreſs of Neceſſity on your Affirmative, more then we do on the Negative; you ſay that no man can be ſaved without your Affirmative [that the Pope is the univerſal Head and Governor] But we ſay not that no man can be ſaved that holdeth not our *Negative*, [that he is not the Vice-Chriſt] For one that hath the plague or leproſie may live. Therefore

it

it is you that must prove that *all* the Catholike Church was still of your mind. 3. And it is an Accident, and but an Accident of a smaller corrupted part of the Catholike Church that you would oblige me to prove the *Negation* of; and therefore it is utterly needless to my proof of a Visible Catholike Church. For I will without it prove to you a successive Visibility of the Catholike Church, from the Visibility of its Essential or Constitutive parts (of which your Pope is none.) I will prove a successive visible Church that hath still professed faith in God the Father, Son and Holy Ghost, and been united to the Universal Head, and had particular Pastors, some fixed, some unfixed, and held all essential to a Christian. And proving this, I have proved the Church of which I am a member. To prove that *England* hath been so long a Kingdom, requireth no more but to prove the two Essential parts, King and Subjects, to have so long continued united. It requireth not that I prove that it ever either *had*, or *opposed* a Vice-King. This is our plain case. If a man have a botch on one of his hands; it is not needful in order to my proving him a man heretofore, that I prove he was born and bred without it: so

be it I prove that he was born a man, it sufficeth. Nor is it needfull that I prove the other hand alwaies to have been free, in order to prove it a member of the body: It sufficeth that I prove it to have been still *a hand.*

I do therefore desire you to perform your work, and prove that [no Congregation hath been still visible, but such as yours] or that [the whole Catholike Church hath ever since the ascention held a Humane Universal Governour under Christ,] or else I shall take it as a giving up your cause as indefensible. And observe, if you shall prove only that *a part* of the Catholike Church still held this (which you can never do) then, 1. You will make the Contrary opinion as Consistent with salvation as yours. For the rest of the Catholike Church is savable .2. And then you will allow me to turn your Argument against your self as much as it is against us (and so cast it away.) *e. g.* [what ever Congregation of Christians is now the true Church of Christ, hath been alwaies Visible: But no Congregation of Christians hath been alwaies Visible, but that which *quoad partem* denyeth the Popes universal Headship; therefore whatever Congregation

Congregation of Christians is the true Church, denyeth the Popes universal Headship.

Well! but for all this (supposing you will do your part) I will fail you in nothing that's reasonable, which I can perform. A Catholike Church in all ages that was against the Pope, in every member of it, I hope I cannot shew you; because I hope that you are members, though corrupt. But you shall have more then a particular Congregation, or a hundred.

1. At this present, two or three parts of the Catholike Church is known to be against your Universal Monarchy. The Greeks, Armenians, Ethiopians, *&c.* besides the Protestants. 2. In the last age there were as many or more. 3. In the former ages till *An. D.* 1000. there were neer as many, or rather many more. For more be fain off in *Tendut*, *Nubia*, and other parts then the Protestants that came in. 4. About the year 600. there were many more, incomparably; and I think then, but at least of 400. years after Christ I never yet saw valid proof of one Papist in all the world, that is, one that was for the Popes Universal Monarchy or Vice-Christ-ship. So that

moſt of the Catholike Church (about three parts to one) hath been againſt you to this day; and all againſt you for many hundred years. Could I name but a Nation againſt you, I ſhould think I had done nothing; much leſs if I cited a few men in an age. 5. And all thoſe of *Ethiopia*, *India*, &c. that are without the verge and awe of the Ancient Roman Empire, never ſo much as gave the Pope that Primacy of dignity, which thoſe within the Empire gave him, when he was chief, as the Earl of *Arundel* is of the Earls of *England* that governeth none of them, and as the Lord Chancellor may be the chief judge, that hath no power *in alieno foro*: or as the Eldeſt Juſtice is chief in the County and on the bench, that ruleth not the reſt. Miſtake not this Primacy for Monarchy, nor the Romane Empire for the world, and you can ſay nothing.

At preſent, *ad hominem*, I give you ſufficient proof of this ſucceſſion. As you uſe to ſay that the preſent Church beſt knew the Judgement of the former age, and ſo on to the head, and ſo Tradition beareth you out: I turn this unreſiſtibly againſt you. The far greateſt part of Chriſtians in the world that now are in poſſeſſion of

the

the doctrine contrary to your Monarchy, tell us that they had it from their Fathers, and so on. And as in Councils, so with the Church Real, the Major part (three to one) is more to be credited then the Minor part; especially when it is a visible self-advancement that the Minor part insisteth on. 6. And were not this enough, I might add, that your western Church it self in its Representative Body at *Constance* and *Basil*, hath determined that not the Pope but a General Council is the chief Governor under Christ; and that this hath been still the judgement of the Church, and that its Heresie in whoever that hold the Contrary. 7. And no man can prove that one half or tenth part of your people called Papists are of your opinion: For they are not called to profess it by words: and their obedience is partly forced, and partly upon other principles; some obeying the Pope as their western Patriarch of chief dignity; and some and most doing all for their own peace and safety: Their outward acts will prove no more.

And now Sir, I have told you what Church of which we are members, hath been visible; yea and what part of it hath opposed the Vice-Christ of *Rome*. This I delayed not

not an hour after I received yours, because you desired speed. Accordingly I crave your speedy return; and intreat you to advise with the most learned men (whether Jesuites or others) of your party in London that think it worth their thoughts and time: not that I have any thoughts of being their Equal in learning, but partly because the case seemeth to me so exceeding palpable, that I think it will suffice me to supply all my defects against the ablest men on earth, or all of them together, of your way; and principally because I would see your strength, and know the most that can be said, that I may be rectified if I err (which I suspect not) or confirmed the more if you cannot evince it, and so may be true to Gods Truth and my own soul.

Rich. Baxter.

Mr. *Johnſons* ſecond PAPER.

Sir,

IT was my happineſs to have this Argument tranſmitted into your learned and quiet hands; which gratefully returns as fair a meaſure as it received from you: that Animoſities on both ſides ſepoſed, Truth may appear in its full ſplendour, and ſeat it ſelf in the Center of both our hearts.

To your firſt Exception.

My *Theſis* was ſufficiently made cleer to my friend, who was concerned in it; and needed no explication in its addreſs to the learned.

To your ſecond Exception.

My Propoſitions were long, that my Argument (as was required) might be very ſhort, and not exceed the quantity of half a ſheet: which enforced me to penetrate many Syllogiſms into one; and by that means in the firſt not to be ſo preciſe in form, as otherwiſe I ſhould have been.

To

To your third Exception.

Seeing I required nothing but Logicall form in Anſwering, I conceive that regard was more to be had amongſt the learned to that, then to the errours of the vulgar: that whileſt ignorance attends to moſt words, learning might attend to moſt reaſon.

To your fourth Exception.

My Argument contains not preciſely the terms of my *Theſis*: becauſe, when I was called upon to haſten my Argument, I had not then at hand my *Theſis*. Had I put more in my *Theſis*, then I prove in my Argument, I had been faulty; but proving more then my *Theſis* contained (as I cleerly do) no body hath reaſon to find fault with me, ſave my ſelf. The *reall* difference betwixt *Aſſemblies of Chriſtians*, and *Congregation of Chriſtians*, and betwixt Salvation is *only to be had* in thoſe Aſſemblies, and Salvation is *not to be had* out of that Congregation, I underſtand not: ſeeing all particular aſſemblies of true Chriſtians, muſt make one Congregation.

To your Anſwer to my firſt Syllogiſm.

He who diſtinguiſhes Logically the terms of any propoſition, muſt not apply

his

his diſtinction to ſome one part of the *term* only, but to the whole *term*, as it ſtands in the propoſition diſtinguiſhed. Now in my propoſition I affirm, that the Congregation of Chriſtians I ſpeak of there, is ſuch a Congregation, *that it is the true Church of Chriſt*, that is, (as all know) the whole Catholike Church: and you diſtinguiſh thus, That I either mean *by Congregation* the whole Catholike Church, or only ſome part of it as, if one ſhould ſay, *Whatſoever Congregation of men is the Common-wealth of England*, and another in anſwer to it ſhould diſtinguiſh, either by *Congregation of men* you mean the whole Common-wealth, or ſome part of it, when all men know, that by *the Common-wealth of England* muſt be meant the whole Common-wealth: for no part of it is the Common-wealth of *England.*

Again you diſtinguiſh, that ſome things are Eſſentials, or Neceſſaries, and others Accidents, which are acknowledged or practiſed in the Church. Now to apply this diſtinction to my Propoſition, you muſt diſtinguiſh that which I ſay is acknowledged to have been *ever* in the Church by *the Inſtitution* of Chriſt, either to be meant of an Eſſential, or an Accident; when all the world

world knows that whatsoever is acknowledged to *have have been ever in the Church by Christs Institution*, cannot be meant of *any Accidental thing*, but of a *necessary, unchangeable* and *Essential* thing, in Christs true Church. If one should advance this proposition, Whatsoever Congregation is the true Church of Christ, acknowledges the Eucharist ever to have been *by Christs Institution* a proper Sacrament of the new Law: and another should distinguish (as you do my proposition) This may be meant *either of an Essential or Accidental thing to Christs true Church*: Seeing whatsoever is acknowledged to have been alwaies in Christs Church and instituted by Christ, cannot be acknowledged but as *necessary and essential* to his Church. If therefore my *Major*, as the terms lie expressed in it, be true, it should have been granted: if false, it should have been denyed. But no Logick allows that it should be distinguished into such different members, whereof one is expressly excluded in the very terms of the proposition. These distinctions therefore, though learned and substantial in themselves, yet were they here unseasonable, and too illogical to ground an answer in forme (as you ground yours) still insisting

ſiſting upon them in your addreſs almoſt to every propoſition. Hence appears firſt, that I uſed no fallacy at all *ex Accidente*: ſeeing my propoſition could not be verified of *an Accident*. Secondly that all your inſtances of *Spain*, *France*, &c. which include *Accidents*, are not appoſite; becauſe your propoſitions, as they lie, have no term which excludes *Accidental Adjuncts*, as mine hath.

To the Proof of my *Major*. *Syll.* 2.

You ſeem to grant the *Major* of my ſecond Syllogiſm; not excepting any thing material againſt it.

To my *Minor*.

You fall again into the former diſtinctions, now diſproved and excluded, of the meaning of *Congregation*, &c. in my propoſition, and would have me to underſtand determinately either the whole Catholike Church, or ſome part of it, (and ſo make four terms in my Syllogiſm:) whereas in my *Minor*, *Congregation of Chriſtians* is taken generically, and abſtracts, as an univerſal, from all particulars. I ſay *no Congregation*, which is an univerſal negative; and when I ſay, none, Save *that Congregation which acknowledges Saint* Peter, *&c.* the term *Congregation* ſuppoſes for the ſame whole Catholike Church mentioned in my former

former Syllogiſm, but expreſſes it under a general term of Congregation *in confuſo*; as I expreſs *Homo*, when I ſay he is *Animal*, *a man*, when I ſay he is a *living creature*, but only *generically*, or *in confuſo*. Now ſhould I have intended determinately either the whole Catholike Church, or any part of it, I ſhould have made an inept Syllogiſm, which would have run thus. Whatſoever true Church of Chriſt is now the true Church of Chriſt, hath been always viſible, *&c.* But no true Church of Chriſt hath been alwaies viſible, ſave the true Church of Chriſt, which acknowledges Saint *Peter*, &c. *Ergo* whatſoever true Churh of Chriſt is now the true Church, acknowledges Saint *Peter*, &c. which would have been *idem per idem*; for every one knows, that the true Church of Chriſt, is now the true Church of Chriſt. But ſpeaking, as I do in abſtractive and generical terms, I avoid this abſurdity, and frame a true Syllogiſm.

Now my meaning in this *Minor* could be no other then this, which my words expreſs; That the Congregation, that is, *the whole Congregation* acknowledges Saint *Peter*, &c. and is viſible, *&c.* and not any part, great or ſmall of it. For when I ſay, the Parliament of theſe Nations doth, or hath

hath enacted a Statute, who would demand of me, whether I meant the whole Parliament, or ſome determinate part of it? You ſhould therefore have denyed, not thus diſtinguiſhed my *Minor* quite againſt the expreſs words of it. What you ſay again of Eſſentials and Accidents, is already refuted; and by that alſo your Syllogiſm, brought by way of inſtance. For your propoſition doth not ſay, that the Church of *Rome* acknowledges thoſe things were *alwaies done*, and that by *Chriſts Inſtitution*, as my propoſition ſays ſhe acknowledges Saint *Peter* and his ſucceſſors.

To my third Syllogiſm.

Granting my *Major*, you diſtinguiſh the term *Paſtors* in my *Minor*, into *particular* and *univerſal*, *fixed* and *unfixed*, &c. I anſwer, that the term *Paſtours* (as before *Congregation*) ſignifies determinately no one of theſe, but generically and *in confuſo* all; and ſo abſtracts from each of them in particular, as the word *Animal* abſtracts from *homo* and *brutum*. Neither can I mean ſome parts of the Church only had Paſtors; for I ſay, *whatſoever Congregation of Chriſtians is now the true Church of Chriſt, hath alwaies had viſible Paſtors and People united.* Now *the Church* is not a

part but the whole Church, that is, both the whole body of the Church, and all particular Churches the parts of it. And hence is ſolved your argument of the Indians, of people converted by lay-men, when particular Paſtors are dead, *&c.* For thoſe were ſubjects of the chief Biſhop alone, till ſome inferiour Paſtors were ſent to them. For when they were taught the Chriſtian Doctrine, in the explication of that Article, *I believe the Holy Catholike Church,* they were alſo taught, that they being people of Chriſts Church, muſt ſubject themſelves to their lawful Paſtors, this being a part of the Chriſtian doctrine. *Heb.* 13. who though abſent in body, may yet be preſent in ſpirit with them, as Saint *Paul* ſaith of himſelf, 1 *Cor.* 5. 3.

Your Anſwer to the confirmation of my *Major* ſeems ſtrange. For I ſpeak of *viſible* Paſtors, and you ſay tis true of an *Inviſible* Paſtor, that is, Chriſt our Saviour, who is now in heaven, *inviſible* to men on earth. The reſt is a repetition of what is immediately before anſwered.

Epheſ. 4. proves not only that ſome particular Churches, or parts of the whole Church, muſt alwaies have Paſtors, but that the whole Church it ſelf muſt have Paſtors,

Paſtors, and every particular Church in it; for it ſpeaks of that Church which is *the Body of Chriſt*, which can be no leſs then the whole Church. For no particular Church alone is his myſtical Body, but only a part of it.

Epheſ. 4. is not directly alledged to prove an univerſal Monarch, (as you ſay) but to prove an uninterrupted continuance of viſible Paſtors; that being only affirmed in the propoſition, which I prove by it. 2. This is already Anſwered.

I ſtand to the judgement of any true Logitian, nay or expert Lawyer, or rational perſon, whether a Negative propoſition be to be proved otherwiſe then by obliging him who denies it, to give an inſtance to infringe it. Should you ſay, *no man hath right to my Benefice and Function in my pariſh, ſave my ſelf*, and another ſhould deny what you ſaid; would not you, or any rational man in your caſe, anſwer him, that by denying your propoſition he affirmed that ſome other had right to them, and to make good that affirmation was obliged to produce who that was: which till he did, you ſtill remained the ſole juſt poſſeſſour of your Benefice as before; and every one will judge, that he had no reaſon to deny your

aſſertion, when he brought no proof againſt it. This is our caſe.

The Contradiction, which you would draw from this, againſt my *Nego, Concedo,* &c. exacted from the Reſpondent, and nothing elſe, follows not. For that preſcription is to be underſtood, that the Reſpondent of himſelf, without ſcope given him by the opponent, was not to uſe any other forms in Anſwering; But if the opponent ſhould require that the reſpondent give reaſons, or inſtances, or proofs, of what he denies, that then the Reſpondent is to proceed to them. And this is moſt ordinary in all Logicall Diſputations, where ſtrict form is obſerved, and known to every yong Logitian. Inſtances therefore demanded by the opponent, were not excluded, but only ſuch excurſions out of form, as ſhould proceed from the reſpondent, with out being exacted by the opponent.

You ſay, though I make a Negative of it, I may put it in other terms at my pleaſure. But the queſtion is not what I may do, but what I did: I required not an Anſwer to an Argument, which I may frame, but to that which I had then framed, which was expreſſed in a negative propoſition.

You tell me if I prove the Popes univerſal

ſal Supremacy, you will be a Papiſt: And I tell you, I have proved it by this very Argument, That either *He* hath that ſupremacy, or ſome other Church; denying that he hath alwaies had it, hath been alwaies viſible; and that Church I require ſhould be named, if any ſuch be, and whileſt you refuſe to name that Church (as here you do) you neither anſwer the Argument, nor become a Papiſt.

You ſay *I affirm*, and *I muſt prove*. I ſay in the propoſition, about which we now ſpeak, I affirm not, and ſo muſt not prove; and you by denying it, muſt affirm, and ſo muſt prove.

You prove it is not your part here to prove, becauſe the Popes ſupremacy could not be denyed, before it was affirmed; and you muſt be obliged to prove that denyal. I oblige you not to prove a continued viſible Church formally and expreſly denying it, but that it was of ſuch a Conſtitution as was inconſiſtent with any ſuch ſupremacy, or could and did ſubſiſt without it; which is an Affirmative.

You affirm, that becauſe I ſay you cannot be ſaved if you deny that Supremacy, and you ſay that I may be ſaved though I hold it, therefore you are not bound to prove what I reprove, but I to prove my negative propoſition. But this would prove

as well, that a Mahumetan is not bound to prove his religion to you, but you to prove yours to him, becauſe you ſay he cannot be ſaved being a Mahumetan; and he ſays, that you may be ſaved being a Chriſtian. See you not, that the obligation of proof in Logicall form depends not of the firſt poſition, or *Theſis*, but muſt be drawn from the immediate propoſition, affirmative or negative, which is or ought to be propoſed?

To what you ſay of an Accident and a corrupt part, I have already anſwered.

To what you ſay of a vice-king, not being neceſſary to the Conſtitution of a kingdom, but a king and ſubjects only, is true, if a vice-king be not inſtituted by the Full power of an Abſolute Authority over that kingdom, to be an ingredient into the eſſence of the Kingdom, in the Kings abſence: But if ſo conſtituted, it will be eſſential; now my propoſition ſaith, and my Argument proves, that *by the Abſolute Authority of Chriſt, Saint* Peter *and his Succeſſors were inſtituted Governors in Chriſts place of his whole viſible Church*; and whatſoever Government Chriſt inſtitutes of his Church, muſt be eſſential to his Church. You ſee now the Diſparity.

You

You inſiſt to have me prove a Negative; and I inſiſt to have you prove that Affirmative, which you fall into by denying my Negative, and leave it to judgement, whoſe exaction is the more conform to reaſon, and logical form.

But *if I prove not here*, ſay you, *the whole Catholike Churches holding ever the Popes Supremacy, you ſhall take it as a giveing up my cauſe.* I tell you again, that I have proved it by this very Argument, by force of Syllogiſtical form: and it is not reaſonable to judge that I have given up my cauſe, if I prove not again, what I have already proved.

Your taking upon you the part of an opponent now is, you know, out of Seaſon; when that is yours, mine ſhall be the Reſpondent.

AT length you give a fair attempt to ſatisfie your obligation, and to return ſuch an inſtance as I demanded of you. But you are too free by much in your offer. I demand one Congregation, and you promiſe to produce more then an hundred. But as they abound in the number, ſo are they deficient in the quality

which I require. I demand, *that the Anſwerer nominate any Congregation of Chriſtians, which alwayes till this preſent time ſince Chriſt hath been viſible*, &c. and you tell me of more then an hundred Congregations, beſides that which acknowledges Saint *Peter*, &c. whereof *not any one* hath been all that deſigned time viſible: which is as if I had demanded an Anſwerer to nominate any Family of Gentry, which hath ſucceſſively continued ever ſince *William* the Conquerour till this preſent time; and he who undertakes to ſatisfie my demand, ſhould nominate more then a hundred Families, whereof not ſo much as one continued half that time. You nominate firſt *all theſe preſent, the Greeks, Armenians, Ethiopians, beſides the Proteſtants.* Theſe you begin with. Now to ſatisfie my demand, you muſt aſſert, that theſe, whom you firſt name, are both one Congregation, and have been viſible ever ſince Chriſts time. This you do not in the purſute of your Allegations. For *Numb.* 2. you nominate none at all, but tell me, that *in the laſt age there were as many or more.* What were theſe *as many or more*? were they the ſame which you nominated firſt, or others? I required ſome determinate Con-

gregation

gregation to be nominated all the while, and you tell me of *as many or more*, but ſay not of what determinate congregation they were. In your *Num.* 3. you tell me, in the former ages, till one thouſand, there *were neer as many, or rather many more.* A fair account! But in the mean time you nominate none, much leſs proſecute you-thoſe with whom you begun. *Num.* 4. You ſay, in the year ſix hundred there *were many more incomparably.* What *many*? what *more*? were they the ſame which you nominated in the beginning, and made one Congregation with them? or were they quite different Congregations? what am I the wiſer by your ſaying *many more incomparably*, when you tell me not what, or who they were? Then you ſay, *But at leaſt for four hundred years after Chriſt, I never yet ſaw valid proof of one Papiſt in all the world, that is, one that was for the Popes univerſal Monarchy, or vice-Chriſtſhip.* What then? are there no proofs in the world, but what you have ſeen? or may not many of thoſe proofs be valid which you have ſeen, though you eſteem them not ſo? and can you think it reaſonable, upon your ſingle *not-ſeeing*, or *not-judging* only, to conclude abſolutely, as you here do, *that all have been*

againſt

againſt us for many hundred years? In your *Num.* 5. You name *Ethiopia* and *India*, as having been without the limits of the *Roman* Empire, whom you deny to have acknowledged any ſupremacy of power and authority above all other Biſhops. You might have done well to have cited at leaſt one antient Author for this Aſſertion. Were thoſe primitive Chriſtians of another kind of Church-order and Government, then were thoſe under the *Roman* Empire *? When the *Roman* Emperors were yet Heathens, had not the Biſhop of *Rome* the Supremacy over all other Biſhops through the whole Church? and did thoſe Heathen Emperors give it him? How came St. *Cyprian*, in time of the Heathen Empire to requeſt *Stephen* the Pope to puniſh and *depoſe* the Biſhop of *Arles*, as we ſhall ſee hereafter? Had he that authority (think you) from an Heathen Emperour? See now how little your Allegations are to the purpoſe, where you nominate any determinate Congregations to ſatisfie my demand.

* But how far from truth this is, appears from St. *Leo*, in his Sermons *de natali ſuo*, where he ſaies, *Sedes Roma Petri, quicquid non poſſidet almus, Religione tenet*; and by this, that the *Abyſſines* of Ethiopia *were under the Patriarch of* Alexandria *antiently, which Patriarch was under the Authority of the Romane Biſhop, as we ſhall preſently ſee.*

I had no reaſon to demand of you different congregations, of all ſorts and Sects oppoſing the Supremacy, to have been ſhewn viſible in all ages. I was not ſo ignorant, as not to know, that the *Nicolaitans*, *Valentinians*, *Gnoſticks*, *Manichees*, *Montaniſts*, *Arians*, *Donatiſts*, *Neſtorians*, *Eutychians*, *Pelagians*, *Iconoclaſts*, *Berengarians*, *Waldenſians*, *Albigenſes*, *Wicleffiſts*, *Huſſits*, *Lutherans*, *Calviniſts*, &c. each following others had ſome kind of viſibility, divided and diſtracted each to his own reſpective age, from our time to the Apoſtles, in joyning their heads and hands together againſt the Popes Supremacy. But becauſe theſe could not be called *one ſucceſſive Congregation of Chriſtians*, being all together by the ears amongſt themſelves; I ſhould not have thought it a demand beſeeming a Scholar, to have required ſuch a viſibility as this. Seeing therefore all you determinately nominate, are as much different as theſe; pardon me, if I take it not for any ſatisfaction at all to my demand, or acquittance of your obligation. Bring me a viſible ſucceſſion of any *one* Congregation of Chriſtians, of the ſame belief, profeſſion, and communion, for the deſigned time, oppoſing that Supremacy, and

and you will have ſatisfied: but till that be done, I leave it to any equal judgement, whether my demand be ſatisfied or no. You anſwer to this, That all thoſe, who are nominated by you, are *parts of the Catholike Church, and ſo one Congregation.* But Sir, give me leave to tell you, that in your principles, you put both the Church of *Rome* and your ſelves, to be parts of the Catholike Church: and yet ſure you account them not one Congregation of Chriſtians, ſeeing by ſeparation one from another they are made two: or if you account them *one*, why did you ſeparate your ſelves, and ſtill remain ſeparate from communion with the *Roman* Church? why poſſeſſed you your ſelves of the Biſhopricks and Cures of your own Prelates and Paſtors, they yet living in Queen *Elizabeths* time? and drew both your ſelves and their other ſubjects from all ſubjection to them, and communion with them? Is this diſunion, think you, fit to make one and the ſame Congregation of you and them? is not charity, ſubordination, and obedience to the ſame ſtate and government required as well to make one Congregation of Chriſtians, as it is required to make one Congregation of Commonwealths men? Though therefore you do account

count them all parts of the Catholike Church, yet you cannot make them in your principles *one Congregation* of Christians. Secondly, your position is not true; the particulars named by you neither are, nor can be parts of the Catholike Church, unless you make *Arians*, and *Pelagians*, and *Donatists*, parts of the Catholike Church: which were either to deny them to be Hereticks and Schismaticks; or to affirm, that Hereticks and Schismaticks, separating themselves from the communion of the Catholike Church, notwithstanding that separation, do continue parts of the Catholike Church. For who knows not that the *Ethiopians* to this day are * *Eutychian* Hereticks. And a great part of those Greeks and Armenians, who deny the Popes Supremacy, are infected with the Heresie of *Nestorius*, and all of them profess generally all those points of faith with us against you, wherein you differ from us; and deny to use Mosaical ceremonies. They mention not the

* See *Rosse* his view of Religions, *p.* 99. 489, 492, &c. Where he saies that they circumcise their children the eighth day, they council of *Calcedon*, because (saies he) they are Eutychians and Jacobites, and confesses that their Patriarch is in subjection to the Patriarch of *Alexandria*, &c. See more of the Chofti, Jacobites, Maronites, *&c. p.* 493, 494. where he confesses that many of them are now subject to the Pope, and have renounced their old errors.

com-

communicate with you, or to eſteem you other then Hereticks and Schiſmaticks, unleſs you both agree with them in thoſe differences of faith, and ſubject your ſelves to the obedience of the Patriarch of *Conſtantinople*, as to the chief Head and Governour of all Chriſtian Churches next under Chriſt; and conſequently as much a vice-Chriſt, in your account, as the Pope can be conceived to be. See, if you pleaſe, *Hieremias* Patriarch of *Conſtantinople*, his Anſwer to the Lutherans, eſpecially in the beginning and end of the book; *Acta Theologorum Wittebergenſium*, &c. and Sir *Edwyn Sands*, of this ſubject, in his Survey, *p.* 232, 233, 242, &c.

Either therefore you muſt make the Eutychians and Neſtorians no Hereticks, and ſo contradict the Oecumenical Councils of *Epheſus*, and *Chalcedon*, which condemned them as ſuch; and the conſent of all Orthodox Chriſtians, who ever ſince eſteemed them no others; or you muſt make condemned Hereticks parts of the Catholick Church, againſt all antiquity and Chriſtianity. And for thoſe Greeks neer *Conſtantinople*, who are not infected with Neſtorianiſm and Eutychianiſm, yet in the Proceſſion of the Holy Ghoſt, againſt both

both us and you, they muſt be thought to maintain manifeſt Hereſie; it being a point in a fundamental matter of faith, the Trinity: and the difference betwixt thoſe Greeks and the Weſtern Church, now for many hundred of years, and in many General Councils eſteemed and defined to be real and great; yea ſo great, that the Greeks left the Communion of the *Roman* Church upon that difference alone, and ever eſteemed the Biſhop of *Rome* and his party to have fallen from the true faith, and loſt his ancient authority by that ſole pretended error; and the Latins alwaies eſteemed the Greeks to be in a damnable error, in maintaining the contrary to the doctrine of the Weſtern or *Roman* Church in that particular. And yet ſure they underſtood what they held, and how far they differed one from another, much better then ſome Novel writers of yours, who preſt by force of Argument, have no other way left them to maintain a perpetual viſibility, then by extenuating that difference of *Proceſſion* betwixt the Greek and Latin Church, which ſo many ages before Proteſtancy ſprung up, was eſteemed a main fundamental error by both parts, cauſed the Greeks to abandon all ſubjection and Communion to the Biſhops

See *Nilus* on this ſubject.

ſhops of *Rome*; made them ſo divided the one from the other, that they held each other Hereticks, Schiſmaticks, and deſertors of the true faith, as they continue ſtill to do to this day, and yet you will have them both to be parts of the Catholike Church.

But when you have made the beſt you can of theſe Greeks, Armenians, Ethiopians, Proteſtants, whom you firſt name, you neither have deduced, nor can deduce them ſucceſſively in all ages till Chriſt, *as a different Congregation of Chriſtians, from that which holds the Popes Supremacy*; which was my propoſition. For in the year 1500. thoſe who became the firſt Proteſtants, were not a Congregation different from thoſe who held that ſupremacy; nor in the year 500. were the Greeks a viſible Congregation *different from it*; nor in the year 300. were the Neſtorians; nor in the year 200. the Eutychians *a different Congregation from thoſe who held the ſaid Supremacy*: But in thoſe reſpective years, thoſe who firſt begun thoſe Hereſies, were involved within that Congregation, which held it, as a part of it, and aſſenting therein with it: who after in their ſeveral ages and beginnings fell off from it, as dead branches from the

the tree; that, ſtill remaining what it ever was, and *only* continuing in a perpetuall viſibility of ſucceſſion.

Though therefore you profeſs never to have ſeen convincing proof of this in the firſt 400 years, & labour to infringe it in the next ages, yet I will make an eſſay to give you a taſte of thoſe innumerable proofs of this *viſible Conſent* in the Biſhop of *Rome's* Supremacy, not of *Order* only, but of *Power*, *Authority*, & *Juriſdiction* over all other Biſhops, in the enſuing inſtances, which happened within the firſt 400, or 500, or 600, years.

(a) *John* Biſhop of *Antioch* makes an Appeal to Pope *Simplicius*. And *Flavianus* (b) Biſhop of *Conſtantinople*, being depoſed in the falſe Councill of *Epheſus*, immediately appeals to the Pope, as to his judge. (c) *Theodoret* was by Pope *Leo* reſtored, and that by an (d) appeal unto a juſt judgement. (e) Saint *Cyprian* deſires Pope *Stephen* to depoſe *Marcian* Biſhop of *Arles*, that another might be ſubſtituted in his place. And to evince the ſupream Authority of the Biſhops of *Rome*, it is determined in the (f) Council of *Sardis*, That no Biſhop depoſed by other neighbouring Biſhops, pretending to be heard again, was to have any ſucceſſour appointed,

(a) *Liberatus in Brev. c. 16.*
(b) *Epiſt. præambula. Concil. Chalcedon.*
(c) *Concil. Chalcedon. Act. 1.*
(d) *Concil. Chalcedon. Act. 8.*
(e) *St. Cyprian. Epiſt. 67.*
(f) *Concil. Sard. cap. 4. cited by St. Athan. Apol. 2 pag. 753.*

appointed, until the caſe were defined by the Pope. *Euſtathius* (g) Biſhop of *Sebaſt* in *Armenia* was reſtored by Pope *Liberius* his Letters read and received in the Council of *Tyana*; and (h) Saint *Chryſoſtome* expreſly deſires Pope *Innocent* not to puniſh his Adverſaries, if they do repent. Which evinces that Saint *Chryſoſtome* thought that the Pope had power to puniſh them. And the like is written to the Pope by the (i) Council of *Epheſus* in the caſe of *John* Biſhop of *Antioch*.

(g) *St.* Baſil. *Epiſt.* 74.
(h) *St.* Chryſoſt. *Epiſt.* 2. *ad Innocent.*
(i) *Concil. Epheſ. p.* 2. *Act.* 5.

(k) The Biſhops of the Greek, or Eaſtern Church, who ſided with *Arius*, before they declared themſelves to be Arians, ſent their Legates to *Julius* Biſhop of *Rome* to have their cauſe heard before him againſt Saint *Athanaſius*: the ſame did Saint *Athanaſius* to defend himſelf againſt them: which Arian Biſhops having underſtood from *Julius*, that their Accuſations againſt Saint *Athanaſius*, upon due examination of both parties, were found groundleſs and falſe, required (rather fraudulently, then ſeriouſly) to have a fuller Tryal before a General Council at Rome: which (to take away all ſhew of excuſe from them) Pope *Julius* aſſembled. Saint *Athanaſius* was ſummoned by the Pope to appear before him

(k) *St.* Athanaſ. *ad Solit. Epiſt.* Julius *in lit. ad Arian. ap. Athan. Apoleg.* 1. *pag.* 753. Theodoret. *lib.* 2. *cap.* 4. Athanaſ. *Apol.* 2. *Zozom. lib.* 3. *cap.* 7.

him and the Councill in Judgement: which he presently did, (and many other Eastern Bishops unjustly accused by the Arians aforesaid, had recourse to *Rome* with him,) and expected there a year and a half: All which time his Accusers (though also summoned) appeared not, fearing they should be condemned by the Pope and his Councill. Yet they pretended not (as Protestants have done in these last ages of the Kings of *England*) That *Constantius*, the Arian Emperour of the East, was Head, or chief Governour over their Church in all Causes Ecclesiastical; and consequently that the Pope had nothing to do with them, but only pretended certain frivolous excuses to delay their appearance from one time to another. Where it is worth the noting, that *Julius*, reprehending the said *Arian* Bishops (before they published

The Appeal of *Theodoret* from that Council as to his judge, is so undeniable that *Chamier* is forced to acknowledge it. *Tom.* 2. *l.* 13. *c.* 9. *p.* 498. and the whole Council of *Calcedon*, acknowledged the right of that Appeal, restoring *Theodoret* to his

Bishoprick, by force of an order given upon that Appeal by *Leo* Pope to restore him.

Concerning Saint *Athanasius* being judged and righted by *Julius* Pope, *Chamier. cit. p.* 497. acknowledges the matter of fact to be so, but against all antiquity, pretends that judgment to have been unjust. Which, had it been so, yet it shews a true power of judging in the Pope, though then unduly executed; otherwise Saint *Athanasius*, would never have made use of it. neither can it be condemed of injustice, unless Saint *Athanasius* be also condemed as unjust, in consenting to it.

their Hereſie, and ſo taking them to be Catholikes) for condemning Saint *Athanaſius* in an Eaſtern Councill, gathered by them before they had acquainted the Biſhop of *Rome* with ſo important a cauſe, uſeth theſe words, *An ignoriſtis hanc conſuetudinem eſſe, ut primum nobis ſcribatur; ut hinc quod juſtum eſt, definiri poſſit*, &c. *Are you ignorant, ſaith he, that this is the cuſtome, to write to us firſt, That hence that which is juſt may be defined*, &c. where moſt cleerly it appears, that it belonged particularly to the Biſhop of *Rome* to paſs a definitive ſentence even againſt the Biſhops of the Eaſtern, or Greek Church; which yet is more confirmed by the proceedings of Pope *Innocent* the firſt, about 12. hundred years ſince, in the Caſe of Saint *Chryſoſtome*: Where firſt Saint *Chryſoſtome* appeals to *Innocentius* from the Councill aſſembled at *Conſtantinople*, wherein he was condemned. Secondly *Innocentius* annulls his condemnation,

Niceph. lib. 13. cap. 34.

Chanier. tit. p. 498.

ſayes, other Biſhops reſtored thoſe who were wrongfully depoſed, as well as the Pope. Which though it were ſo, yet never was there any ſingle Biſhop ſave the Pope, who reſtored any, who were out of their reſpective Dioceſs, or Patriarchates, but always collected together in a Synod, by common voice, and that in regard only of their neighbouring Biſhops: whereas the Biſhop of *Rome* by his ſole and ſingle authority, reſtored Biſhops wrongfully depoſed all the Church over.

nation, and declares him innocent. Thridly, he Excommunicates *Atticus* Biſhop of *Conſtantinople*, and *Theophilus* Biſhop of *Alexandria* for perſecuting Saint *Chryſoſtome*. Fourthly, after Saint *Chryſoſtome* was dead in Baniſhment, Pope *Innocentius* Excommunicates *Arcadius* the Emperour of the Eaſt, and *Eudoxia* his wife. Fifthly, the Emperour and Empreſs humble themſelves, crave pardon of him, and were abſolved by him. The ſame is evident in thoſe matters, which paſſed about the year 450. where *Theodoſius* the Emperour of the Eaſt having too much favoured the Eutychian Hereticks by the inſtigation of *Chryſaphius* the Eunuch, and *Pulcheria* his Empreſs, and ſo intermedled too far in Eccleſiaſticall cauſes, yet he ever bore that reſpect to the See of *Rome*, (which doubtleſs in thoſe circumſtances he would not have done, had he not believed it an Obligation) that he would not permit the Eutychian Council at *Epheſus* to be aſſembled, without the knowledge and Authority of the Roman Biſhop *Leo* the firſt; and ſo wrote to him to have his preſence in it, who ſent his Legats unto them. And though both *Leo's* letters were diſſembled, and his Legats affronted, and himſelf excommunicated by

wicked *Dioſcorus*, Patriarch of Alexandria, and preſident of that Coventicle, who alſo was the chief upholder of the Eutychians, yet *Theodoſius* repented before his death, baniſhed his wife *Pulcheria* and *Chryſaphius* the Eunuch, the chief favourers of the Eutychians, and reconciled himſelf to the Church with great evidences of Sorrow and Pennance.

(m) *Concil. Chalced. Action.* 1. (m) Preſently after, *Anno.* 451. follows the Fourth General Council of *Chalcedon*: concerning which theſe particulars occur to our preſent purpoſe. Firſt *Martianus* the Eaſtern Emperour wrote to Pope *Leo*, That by the Popes Authority a General Council might be gathered in what City of the Eaſtern Church he ſhould pleaſe to chuſe. Secondly, both *Anatolius* Patriarch of *Conſtantinople*, and the reſt of the Eaſtern Biſhops, ſent to the legats of Pope *Leo*, by his order, the profeſſion of their Faith. Thirdly, the Popes Legats ſate in the firſt place of the Council before all the Patriarchs.

(n) *Concil. Chalced. Action.* 3. (n) Fourthly, they prohibited (by his order given them) That *Dioſcorus* Patriarch of Alexandria, and chief upholder of the Eutychians, ſhould ſit in the Councill; but be preſented as a guilty perſon to be judged; becauſe he had celebrated a Councill

cill in the Eaſtern Church without the conſent of the Biſhop of *Rome*; *which* (ſaid the Legats) *never was done before, nor could be done lawfully.* This order of Pope *Leo* was preſently put in execution by conſent of the whole Councill, and *Dioſcorus* was judged and condemned; his condemnation and depoſition being pronounced by the Popes Legats, and after ſubſcribed by the Councill. Fifthly, the Popes Legats pronounced the Church of Rome to be * *Caput omnium Eccleſiarum*, the *Head of all Churches*, before the whole Council, and none contradicted them. Sixthly, all the Fathers aſſembled in that Holy Councill, in their Letter to Pope *Leo*, acknowledged themſelves to be *his children*, and wrote to him as to *their Father*. Seventhly, they humbly begged of him, that he would grant, that the Patriarch of *Conſtantinople* might

* Which could not be by reaſon of the Sanctity and truth which was then in it; for the Church of *Milan* and many others in *France*, *Africa*, and *Greece* were alſo then pure and holy, and yet none have this title ſave the Church of *Rome*.

In the time of *Juſtinian* the Emperour, *Agapet* Pope, even in *Conſtantinople*, againſt the will both of the Emperour and Empreſs, depoſed *Anthymus*, and ordained *Mennas* in his place. *Liberat. in Breviario. cap.* 21. *Marcellinus. Comes in Chronico. Concil. Conſtantin. ſub Menna. act.* 4. And the ſame St. *Greg. l.* 7. *Ep.*63. declares that both the Emperour and Biſhop of *Conſtantinople* acknowledged that the Church of *Conſtantinople* was ſubject to the See of *Rome*. And *l.* 7. *Ep.* 37. *Et alibi* pronounces, that in caſe of falling into offences he knew no Biſhop which was not ſubject to the Biſhop of *Rome*.

have the firſt place among the Patriarchs, after that of *Rome*: which notwithſtanding that the Councill had conſented to (as had alſo the Third General Councill of *Epheſus* done before) yet they eſteemed their grants to be of no ſufficient force, untill they were confirmed by the Pope. And *Leo* thought not fit to yield to their petition, againſt the expreſs ordination of the Firſt Councill of *Nice*; where *Alexandria* had the preheminence, as alſo *Antioch* and *Hieruſalem*, before that of *Conſtantinople*.

Saint *Cyril* of *Alexandria*, though he wholly diſallowed *Neſtorius* his doctrine, yet he would not break off Communion with him, till *Celeſtinus* the Pope had condemned him: whoſe Cenſure he required and expected. *Neſtorius* alſo wrote to *Celeſtine*, acknowledging his Authority, and expecting from him the Cenſure of his doctrine. *Celeſtinus* condemned *Neſtorius*, and gave him the ſpace of ten daies to repent, after he had received his condemnation. All which had effect in the Eaſtern Church, where *Neſtorius* was Patriarch of *Conſtantinople*. (o) After this Saint *Cyrill* having received Pope *Leo's* Letters, wherein he gave power to Saint *Cyrill* to execute his

(o) St. *Auguſtin. Tom.* 1 *Epiſt. Rom. Pontif. poſt Epiſt.* 2. *ad Celeſtinum.*

his condemnation againſt *Neſtorius*, and to ſend his condemnatory letters to him, gathered a Council of his next Biſhops, and ſent Letters and Articles to be ſubſcribed, with the Letters of *Celeſtine* to *Neſtorius*: which when *Neſtorius* had received, he was ſo far from repentance, that he accuſed St. *Cyril* in thoſe Articles, to be guilty of the Hereſie of *Apollinaris*: ſo that St. *Cyril* being alſo accuſed of Hereſie, was barred from pronouncing ſentence againſt *Neſtorius*, ſo long as he ſtood charged with that Accuſation. *Theodoſius* the Emperour, ſeeing the Eaſtern Church embroyled in theſe difficulties, writes to Pope *Celeſtine* about the aſſembling of a general Council at *Epheſus*, by *Petronius* afterwards Biſhop of *Bononia* (as is manifeſt in his life written by *Sigonius*) Pope *Celeſtine* in his Letters to *Theodoſius*, not only profeſſeth his conſent to the calling of that Council, but alſo preſcribeth in what form it was to be celebrated; as *Firmus* Biſhop of *Cæſarea* in *Cappadocia* teſtified in the Council of *Epheſus*. Hereupon *Theodoſius* ſent his Letters to aſſemble the Biſhops both of the Eaſt and Weſt to that Council. And *Celeſtine* ſent his Legats thither, with order not to examine again in the Council the cauſe of *Neſtorius*,

Neſtorius, but rather to put *Celeſtines* condemnation of him, given the year before, into execution. St. *Cyril* Biſhop of *Alexandria*, being conſtituted by *Celeſtine* his chief Legate ordinary in the Eaſt, by reaſon of that preheminency, and primacy of his See after that of *Rome*, preſided in the Council: yet ſo, that *Philip*, who was only a Prieſt and no Biſhop, by reaſon that he was ſent *Legatus à Latere* from *Celeſtine*, and ſo ſupplied his place as he was chief Biſhop of the Church, ſubſcribed the firſt, even before St. *Cyril*, and all the other Legats and Patriarchs. In the ſixth Action of this holy Council, *Juvenalis* Patriarch of *Hieruſalem*, having underſtood the contempt, which *John* Patriarch of *Antioch*, who was cited before the Council, ſhewed of the Biſhops and the Popes Legats there aſſembled, expreſſed himſelf againſt him in theſe words, *Quod Apoſtolica ordinatione & Antiqua Traditione* (which were no way oppoſed by the Fathers there preſent) *Antiochena ſedes perpetuo à Romana dirigeretur judicaretur que*, That by Apoſtolical ordination and ancient Tradition the See of *Antioch* was perpetually directed and judged by the See of *Rome*: which words not only evidence the precedency of place,

as

as Dr. *Hammond* would have it, but of power and judicature in the Biſhop of *Rome* over a Patriarch of the Eaſtern Church; and that derived from the time and ordination of the Apoſtles. The Council therefore ſent their decrees, with their condemnation of *Neſtorius*, to Pope *Celeſtine*, who preſently ratified and confirmed them.

Not long after this, in the year 445. *Valentinian* the Emperour makes this *manifeſto* of the moſt high Eccleſiaſtical authority of the See of *Rome*, in theſe words: "Seeing that the merit of St. *Peter*, who is "the Prince of the Epiſcopal Crown, and "the Dignity of the City of *Rome*, and no "leſs the authority of the holy Synod, hath "eſtabliſhed the primacy of the Apoſtoli-"cal See, leſt preſumption ſhould attempt "any unlawful thing againſt the authority "of that See, (for then finally will the "peace of the Churches be preſerved every "where, if the whole univerſality acknow-"ledge their Governour) when theſe "things had been hitherto inviolably ob-"ſerved, *&c.* Where he makes the ſucceſſion from St. *Peter* to be the firſt foundation of the *Roman* Churches primacy; and his authority to be, not only in place, but

See this at length in *Baronius*, in the year 445.

but in power and Goyernment over the whole viſible Church: And adds preſently, that the definitive ſentence of the Biſhop of *Rome*, given againſt any *French* Biſhop, was to be of force through *France*, even without the Emperours Letters Patents. *For what ſhall not be lawful for the authority of ſo great a Biſhop to exerciſe upon the Churches?* And then adds his Imperial precept, in theſe words. "But this "occaſion hath provoked alſo our com- "mand, that hereafter it ſhall not be law- "ful, neither for *Hilarius* (whom to be "ſtill entituled a Biſhop, the ſole humanity "of the meek Prelate (*id eſt*, the Biſhop of "*Rome*) permits) neither for any other to "mingle arms with Eccleſiaſtical matters, "or to reſiſt the commands of the Biſhop "of *Rome*, &c. We define by this our per- "petual decree, that it ſhall neither be "lawful for the *French* Biſhops, nor for "thoſe of other Provinces, againſt the an- "cient cuſtom, to attempt any thing with- "out the authority of the venerable Pope "of the eternal City: But let it be for a "law to them and to all, whatſoever the "authority of the Apoſtolick See hath de- "termined, or ſhall determine. So that "what Biſhop ſoever, being called to the "Tribunal

"Tribunal of the *Roman* Biſhop, ſhall "neglect to come, is to be compelled by "the Governour of the ſame Province, to "preſent himſelf before him. Which evidently proves, that the higheſt, Univerſal, Eccleſiaſtical Judge and Governour was, and ever is to be the Biſhop of *Rome*: which the Council of *Chalcedon* before mentioned, plainly owned, when writing to Pope *Leo* they ſay, *Thou Governeſt us, as the head doth the members, contributing thy good will by thoſe which hold thy place.* Behold a Primacy, not only of Precedency, but of Government and Authority; which *Lerinenſis* confirms, *contr. Hæreſ. cap. 9.* where ſpeaking of *Stephen* Pope, he ſaies, *Dignum, ut opinor, exiſtimans, ſi reliquos omnes tantum fidei devotione, quantum loci authoritate, ſuperabat*: eſteeming it (as I think) a thing worthy of himſelf, if he overcame all others as much in the devotion of faith, as he did in the Authority of his place. And to confirm what this univerſal Authority was; he affirms, that he ſent a Law, Decree, or Command into *Africa*, (*Sunxit*,) That in matter of rebaptization of Hereticks nothing ſhould be innovated; which was a manifeſt argument of his Spiritual Authority over thoſe of *Africa*;

Epiſt. Concil. ad Leon. Pap. Act. 1. & ſequ.

Africa; and *à paritate rationis*, over all others. I will ſhut up all with that which was publickly pronounced, and no way contradicted, and conſequently aſſented to in the Council of *Epheſus*, (one of the four firſt general Councils) in this matter, *Tom.* 2. *Concil. pag.* 327. *Act.* 1. where *Philip*, Prieſt and Legate of Pope *Celeſtine*, ſayes thus, "*Gratias agimus ſanctæ venerandæque ſynodo, quod literis ſancti beatique Papæ noſtri vobis recitatis, ſanctas* "chartas, ſanctis veſtris vocibus, *ſancto eapiti veſtro*, ſanctis veſtris exclamationibus, exhibueritis. Non enim ignorat "veſtra beatitudo, totius fidei, vel etiam "Apoſtolorum, caput eſſe beatum Apoſtolum Petrum. And the ſame *Philip*, *Act.* 3. *p.* 330. proceeds in this manner, Nulli "dubium, imo ſæculis omnibus notum eſt, "quod ſanctus beatiſſimuſque Petrus, Apoſtolorum Princeps & caput, *Fideique columna*, *Eccleſiæ Catholicæ Fundamentum*, à Domino noſtro Jeſu Chriſto, Salvatore generis humani ac redemptore "noſtro claves regni accepit, ſolvendique "ac ligandi peccata poteſtas ipſi data eſt; "qui *ad hoc uſque tempus ac ſemper* in ſuis "ſucceſſoribus vivit & *judicium exercet*: ——Hujus itaque ſecundum ordinem ſucceſſor

ſucceſſor & *locum-tenens*, ſanctus beatiſſimuſque Papa noſter Celeſtinus, nos ipſius præſentiam ſupplentes huc miſit. And *Arcadius* another of the Popes Legats enveighing againſt the Heretick *Neſtorius*, accuſes him, (though he was Patriarch of *Conſtantinople*, which this Council requires to be next in dignity after *Rome*) as of a great crime, that he *contemned the command of the Apoſtolick See*, that is, of Pope *Celeſtine*. Now had Pope *Celeſtine* had no power to command him (and by the like reaſon to command all other Biſhops) he had committed no fault in tranſgreſſing and contemning his command. By theſe teſtimonies it will appear, that what you are pleaſed to ſay, *That the moſt part of the Catholike Church hath been againſt us to this day, and all for many hundred of years*, is far from truth: ſeeing in the time of the holy Oecumenical Councils of *Epheſus* and *Chalcedon*, the univerſal conſent of the whole Catholike Church was for us in this point.

For the age 600. See *St. Gregory* Pope, *l.* 10. *ep.* 30. where Hereticks and Shiſmaticks repenting, were received then into the Church, upon ſolemn promiſe, and publike proteſtation, that they would never any more ſeparate *from*, but alwaies remain *in* the unity of the Catholike Church, and communion in all things with the Biſhop of *Rome*.

As

As to what you ſay of *Congregation of Chriſtians* in the beginning, I anſwer, I took the word *Chriſtians* in a large ſenſe, comprehending in it all thoſe (as it is vulgarly taken) who are Baptized and profeſs to believe in Chriſt, and are diſtinguiſhed from Jews, Mahumetans and Heathens, under the denomination of *Chriſtians.*

What you often ſay of an univerſal Monarch, *&c.* if you take Monarch for an Imperious *ſole Commander*, as temporal Kings are, we acknowledge no ſuch Monarch in the Church: if only for one who hath received power from Chriſt, in meekneſs, charity, and humility to govern all the reſt, for their own eternal good, as brethren or children, we grant it.

What alſo you often repeat of a *Vice-Chriſt*, we much diſlike that title, as proud and inſolent, and utterly diſclaim from it; neither was it ever given by any ſufficient Authority to our Popes, or did they ever accept of it.

As to the Council of *Conſtance*, they never queſtioned the Supremacy of the Pope, as *ordinary chief Governour* of all Biſhops and people in the whole Church: nay they expreſly give it to *Martinus Quintus*, when he was choſen.

But

But in extraordinary caſes, eſpecially when it is doubtful who is true Pope, as it was in the beginning of this Council, till *Martinus Quintus* was choſen: Whether any extraordinary power be in a general Council, above that ordinary power of the Pope: which is a queſtion diſputed by ſome amongſt our ſelves, but touches not the matter in hand; which proceeds only of the ordinary and conſtant Supream Paſtor of all Chriſtians, abſtracting from extraordinary tribunals and powers, which are ſeldom found in the Church, and collected only occaſionally, and upon extraordinary accidents.

Thus honoured Sir, I have as much as my occaſions would permit me, haſtened a reply to your anſwer; and if more be requiſite, it ſhall not be denyed. Only pleaſe to give me leave to tell you, that I cannot conceive my Argument yet anſwered by all you have ſaid to it.

Feb. 3. 1658.

William Johnſon.

Sir,

It was the 21. *of* January, *before your Anſwer came to my hands; and though my*

As to what you ſay of *Congregation of Chriſtians* in the beginning, I anſwer, I took the word *Chriſtians* in a large ſenſe, comprehending in it all thoſe (as it is vulgarly taken) who are Baptized and profeſs to believe in Chriſt, and are diſtinguiſhed from Jews, Mahumetans and Heathens, under the denomination of *Chriſtians.*

What you often ſay of an univerſal Monarch, *&c.* if you take Monarch for an Imperious *ſole Commander*, as temporal Kings are, we acknowledge no ſuch Monarch in the Church: if only for one who hath received power from Chriſt, in meekneſs, charity, and humility to govern all the reſt, for their own eternal good, as brethren or children, we grant it.

What alſo you often repeat of a *Vice-Chriſt*, we much diſlike that title, as proud and inſolent, and utterly diſclaim from it; neither was it ever given by any ſufficient Authority to our Popes, or did they ever accept of it.

As to the Council of *Conſtance*, they never queſtioned the Supremacy of the Pope, as *ordinary chief Governour* of all Biſhops and people in the whole Church: nay they expreſly give it to *Martinus Quintus*, when he was choſen.

But

But in extraordinary caſes, eſpecially when it is doubtful who is true Pope, as it was in the beginning of this Council, till *Martinus Quintus* was choſen: Whether any extraordinary power be in a general Council, above that ordinary power of the Pope: which is a queſtion diſputed by ſome amongſt our ſelves, but touches not the matter in hand; which proceeds only of the ordinary and conſtant Supream Paſtor of all Chriſtians, abſtracting from extraordinary tribunals and powers, which are ſeldom found in the Church, and collected only occaſionally, and upon extraordinary accidents.

Thus honoured Sir, I have as much as my occaſions would permit me, haſtened a reply to your anſwer; and if more be requiſite, it ſhall not be denyed. Only pleaſe to give me leave to tell you, that I cannot conceive my Argument yet anſwered by all you have ſaid to it.

Feb. 3. 1658.

William Johnſon.

Sir,

It was the 21. *of* January, *before your Anſwer came to my hands; and though my*

Reply was made ready by me the third inſtant, yet I have found ſo great difficulties to get it tranſcribed, that it was not poſſible to tranſmit it to you before now. But I hope hereafter I ſhall find Scribes more at leaſure. I muſt deſire you to excuſe what errors you find in the Copy which I ſend; As alſo, that being unwilling to make a farther delay, I am enforced to ſend a Copy which hath in it more interlineations then would otherwiſe become me to ſend to a perſon of your worth. Yet I cannot doubt, but your Candor will paſs by all things of this nature. I am Sir,

Your very humble ſervant,

Feb. 15. 1658. *William Johnſon.*

Worthy Sir,

I have now expected neer three moneths for your rejoynder to the Reply which I made to that anſwer which you were pleaſed to ſend, and return to my Argument concerning the Church of Chriſt; but as yet nothing hath appeared. I muſt confeſs, I have wondered at it, conſidering the earneſtneſs which appeared in you at the firſt, to proceed with ſpeed in a buſineſs of this nature: what the impediment hath

hath been, I am only left to gueſs: but certainly truth is ſtrong, and it will not be found an eaſie thing to oppoſe her while we keep cloſe to form. I am now neceſſitated to go out of London; *ſo that if your Papers come in my abſence, I ſhall hope you will have the patience to expect untill they can be ſent from* London *to me, and my Anſwers returned by the way of* London: *but I do engage not to make a delay longer then the circumſtances of the place and times ſhall enforce.*

Sir, *I do highly honour and eſteem your parts and perſon; and ſhall be very glad to bring that buſineſs to an handſome iſſue which hath been ſo calmly and ſoberly proſecuted. I am an enemy to paſſion; and as I have hitherto found you ſweet and gentle in your proceedings towards me, ſo ſhall you alwaies find me,*

Worthy Sir,

Your friend to ſerve you,

May 2. 1659. William Johnſon.

Sir,

Be pleaſed to return your Anſwer, Papers or Letters which you intend for me, to the ſame place to which you directed your former; by which means, I ſhall be ſecure to receive

them at my houſe, which is fourſcore miles from London.

To Mr. T. L. (*who called me to this work.*)

Sir,

THough I am a ſtranger to you, I thought meet to take notice of the Letters which you ſent your friend here (*T. H.*) It ſeems you urge hard for a Reply, and intimate ſomewhat of triumph in my delay: you ſpeak as an incompetent Judge. God is the Maſter of my time and work; and him I muſt ſerve: and not neglect his greater work, for ſuch trivial objections as your friend hath ſent me, which are anſwered over and over by many ſo long ago. Had you read *Blondel*, *Molineus de novitate Papiſmi*, *Whitaker*, *Sibrandus*, *Lubbertus*, *Chamier*, *Abbots*, *Crakenthorp*, *Spalatenſis*, or one of many that have confuted them, you would ſure call for no more: Or if in *Engliſh* you had read Dr. *Field*, Dr. *White*; yea, or but Sir *Humphery Lind* (to paſs by multitudes) you might have ſeen their vanity. Yea plainly read impartially my two books againſt

againſt Popery, and be a Papiſt if you can. But it ſeems you take it for a poor anſwer to be referred to books. Do not fear it. But yet let me tell you, that my hand is not more legible then my printed books: and if I had ſent you this in print, would that have made it a poor anſwer? Or rather, is not this a poor exception, and ſhews that it is not truth that is lookt after: for truth may be printed as well as written. If you be deceived by the men of the Papal way, let me yet intreat you, but to read over thoſe two books (The ſafe Religion, and the Key for Catholikes): If your ſoul be not worth ſo much labour, take your courſe: I did my duty.

But I muſt ſay, that it is a doleful caſe that profeſſors are ſo ungrounded, that ſuch vanities ſhould carry them away from Catholike verity and unity, to a faction that uſurps the name of Catholikes. To be free with you, I think it is that pride and levity that brings them firſt to ſeparation from our Churches into Sects, and the guilt which they there incur, that prepareth profeſſors to be ſo far forſaken of God, as to be given up to believe a lie, and to turn Papiſts.

O dreadful caſe! that one Biſhop can-

not ſwell in pride, but men muſt make a Religion of his pride! yea and make a Catholike Church of it! yea and plead for it, and make the ſin their own; yea condemn all Chriſtians that liſt not themſelves under this Prince of pride. He is culpably, if not wilfully blind, that hath read Scripture and Church hiſtory, and knoweth not, that the Pope for three hundred years after Chriſt, was not the creature that now he is; nor had for moſt of that time any more Government over other Biſhops, then I have over neighbour Paſtors: and after that time, he was no more an univerſal Head, or Governour, or Vicar of Chriſt, then the Archbiſhop of *Canterbury* was; having indeed a far larger Dioceſs then he, but never was more then the ſwelled Primate of one National (Imperial) Church. When Synods began to be gathered out of a Principality (the Emperours deſiring that means of unity within their Empire), the pride of the Prelates ſet them preſently a ſtriving for ſuperiority, who ſhould ſit higheſt, and write his name firſt, and have the largeſt Dioceſs, *&c*! And now men make a Religion of the fruits of this abominable pride. What are all their diſputings for, and all this ſtir that they

make

make in the world, but to ſet up one man over all the earth? and that to do a ſpiritual work, which conſiſteth not with force, but is managed on conſcience: One wretched man muſt govern the Antipodes on the other ſide of the earth, that is indeed uncapable of truly and juſtly Governing the City of *Rome* it ſelf. Popes, that their own Councils have condemned for raviſhing maids and wives at their doors, for Murders, Simony, Drunkenneſs, Hereſie, denying the Reſurrection and the life to come (that is, being no Chriſtians) theſe forſooth muſt be the univerſal Governours, or we are all undone; and we are damned if we believe it not: O how dreadfull are the effects of ſin; and how great a judgement is a blinded mind! This comes of falling into Sects and parties, which leads men into the gulf of the moſt odious Schiſm (even Popery) in the world.

But if you are engaged in this party, its two to one but you are preſently made partial, and will not ſo much as read what is againſt them; or will believe them if they do but tell you that we write lies; when they are things done in the open ſun, and which they cannot confute, nor dare attempt, leſt they manifeſt their ſhame.

Take from them their Clergies vaſt Dominions, Principalities, Lands and Lordſhips, Riches and worldly Honours, with which they ſo much abound, and then try how many will plead for the Pope: then they'l ſay, If *Baal* be a God, let him plead for himſelf. But I confeſs, I have little hopes of turning any of them, though I could ſhew it them written by an Angel from heaven that Popery is a deceit: for the Scripture that's above Angelical authority declareth it; and by making it a noſe of wax, they take it as if it were not ſenſe, nor intelligible without the Popes interpretation (which in difficult caſes he dare not give). They cry up *the Church*, and when we would have them ſtand to the Church, they ſhamefully turn their backs; and when two or three parts of the Churches through the world are againſt the Papal Soveraignty, they refuſe them as Hereticks or Schiſmaticks. They cry up *Tradition*, and when we offer them in the main point to be tried by it, they diſclaim the Tradition of two or three parts of the univerſal Church as being all Hereticks. And may not any Sect do ſo too as honeſtly as they? yea among the ignorant that know not Chaffe from Corn, they have ſome of them the faces to perſwade

ſwade them that *their Church* is the *greater half* of the Chriſtian world! when they know they ſpeak notoriouſly falſly, or elſe they are unworthy to ſpeak of ſuch things that they underſtand not.

But to what purpoſe ſhould any words be uſed with men, that have taught ſo great a part of the world, not to believe their eyes and other ſenſes! Can any writing make any matter plainer to you, then that Bread is Bread, and Wine is Wine, when you ſee them, and taſt, and eat, and drink them? And yet their general Councils approved by the Pope, have made it an Article of their faith, that the whole ſubſtance of the Bread and Wine is turned into the Body and Blood of Chriſt, ſo that there is left no Bread or Wine, but only that colour, quantity and taſt that before belonged to it. And if you know not Bread when you eat it, or Wine when you drink it, and when the ſenſes of all the ſound men in the world concur with yours, is it not vain for me, or any man to diſpute with you? Can you have any thing brought to a ſurer judgement then to all your ſenſes? And yet no doubt but your ſeducers can ſay ſomething to prove that Bread is not Bread when you ſee and eat it: No wonder then

then if they can confute me. But do they indeed believe themſelves? how is it poſſible? there is no exerciſe of reaſon, and belief that ſuppoſeth not the certainty of ſenſe. If I cannot know Bread and Wine when I ſee, touch, taſt them; then cannot I know the Pope, the Councils, the Scripture, the Prieſt, or any thing elſe. If you think to let go this point of Popery and hold the reſt, you know not what Popery is: for a Pope and Council having determined it, you are damned by them for denying the faith: and if you depart from the infallibility of their Rule and judge in points of faith, or at leaſt from the obligation of it, in one thing, they will confeſs to you that you may as well do it in more; *Falſe in this, and certain in nothing*, is their own concluſion. Sir, I have not been unwilling to know the truth, having a ſoul to ſave or loſe as well as you, and having as much reaſon to be loth to periſh. If you have ſo far forfeited the Grace of God, as meerly to follow the pride of a pretended *Vice-Chriſt* (that hath turned doctrine into error, worſhip into ſuperſtition and dead formality, light into darkneſs, diſcipline into confuſion mixt with tyranny); if meerly to ſet up one Tyrant over the conſciences

ſciences (and bodies too) of all believers in the world, you can fall into a Sect, deny Scripture, Reaſon, the Judgement and Tradition of moſt of the Church, and your own and all mens eye-ſight, taſt and other ſenſes, the Lord have mercy on you, if you be not paſt it: I have done with you, yet remaining

An unfeigned deſirer of your Welfare, and lamenter of the Apoſtacies and giddineſs of theſe times,

May 18. 1659. Richard Baxter.

Did you know what it is, by looſe and falſe allegations, to be put to read ſo many Volumes (in great part) in folio, to try whether the alledger ſay true or falſe, you would not expect that I ſhould return an anſwer, and read ſo much of ſo many folios in any leſs then ten or eleven daies, which I think hath been all that I have had to write and read ſo much.

The

The Reader must take notice that I wrote the former Letter to the person that sent Mr. Johnsons *Letters, with a charitable jealousie, that if he were himself in doubt, he might be resolved: But in his return he fully disclaimed Popery, and assured me, that it is for the sake of some friends that he desired my labour, and not for his own.*

R. B.

28 MR 59

The

The Reply to Mr. Johnſons *ſecond* PAPER.

Sir,

THE multitude and urgency of my employments gave me not leave till this day (*May* 2.) ſo much as to read over all your Papers; But I ſhall be as loth to break off our Diſputation, as you can be, though perhaps neceſſity may ſometime cauſe ſome weeks delay. And again, I profeſs, my indignation againſt the Hypocrital Jugling of this age, doth provoke me to welcome ſo ingenuous and candid a diſputant as your ſelf, with great content. But I muſt confeſs alſo, that I was the leſs haſty in ſending you this Reply, becauſe I deſired you might have leiſure to peruſe a Book which I publiſhed ſince your laſt, (A Key for Catholikes;) ſeeing that I have there anſwered you already, and that more largely then I am like to do in this Reply.

For

For the ſharpneſs of that I muſt crave your patience; the perſons and cauſe I thought required it.

Ad 1^m. What explications were made to your Friend of your *Theſis*, I could not take notice of, who had nothing but your writing to Anſwer.

2. If you will not be preciſe in Arguing, you had little reaſon to expect (much leſs ſo ſtrictly to exact) a preciſe Anſwer; which cannot be made as you preſcribed, to an Argument not preciſe.

3. I therefore expect accordingly that the unlearned be not made the Judges of a diſpute which they are not fit to judge of; ſeeing you deſire us to avoid their road.

4. Again I ſay, if you will not be preciſe in arguing, I can hardly be ſo in anſwering. And by [*a Congregation of Chriſtians*] you may mean [*Chriſtians politically related to one Head,*] whether Chriſt, or the Pope: But the word [*Aſſemblies*] expreſſeth their actuall *Aſſembling* together, and ſo excludeth all Chriſtians that are or were Members of no particular aſſemblies, from having Relation as Members to Chriſt (our Head) or the Pope (your Head,) and ſo from being of the *Congregation*,

as

as you Call, *The Church univerſall.*

5. I had great reaſon to avoid the ſnare of an equivocation, or ambiguity, of which you gave me cauſe of jealouſie by your [*whatſoever*] as I told you: as ſeeming to intimate a falſe ſuppoſition: To your *Like*, I anſwer, *it is unlike*, and ſtill more intimates the falſe ſuppoſition. [*Whatſoever Congregation of men is the Commonwealth of England*] is a phraſe that importeth that [*There is a Congregation of men which is not the Common-wealth of England.*] Which is true, there being more men in the world. So [*whatſoever Congregation of Chriſtians is now the true Church*] doth ſeem to import, that you ſuppoſe [*there is a Congregation of Chriſtians* (univocally ſo called) *that are not the true Church*] which you would diſtinguiſh from the other: Which I only let you know at the entrance, that I deny, that you may not think it granted.

Yet I muſt tell you that nothing is more ordinary then for the *Body* to be ſaid to do that which a part of it only doth; As that [*the Church adminiſtreth Sacraments, Diſcipline, Teatheth*, &c. *the Church is aſſembled in ſuch a Council* &c.] when yet it is but

but a *ſmall part of the Church* that doth theſe things. And when *Bellarmine, Gretſer*, &c. ſay [*the Church is the infallible judge of Controverſies of faith,*] they mean not [*the whole Church*] which containeth every Chriſtian, when they tell you that *It is the Pope* they mean. and therefore I had reaſon to enquire into your ſenſe, unleſs I would willfully be over-reacht.

You now ſatisfie me that you mean it univerſally, viz. [*All that Congregation* (or Church) *of Chriſtians which is now the true Church of Chriſt, doth acknowledge*, &c.] which I told you I deny.

6. To my following diſtinction you ſay [*that all the world knows that whatſoever is acknowledged to have been ever in the Church by Chriſts inſtitution, cannot be meant of any accidental thing, but of a neceſſary unchangeable and eſſentiall thing, in Chriſts true Church,*] To which I Reply, Either you ſee the groſs fallacy of this defence, or you do not: If you do not, then never more call for an exact Diſputant, nor look to be delivered from your errors by argumentation, though never ſo convincing. If you do, then you are not faithfull to the truth. In your Major propoſition the words *being* many (as you ſay, you *penetrated* divers arguments

arguments together,) ambiguities were the eaſier hidden in the heap. That which I told you is Accidental to the Church (and that but to a corrupted part) was [the *Acknowledging* of the Papacy as of Chriſts Inſtitution,] and therefore if it were granted that a thing [*of Chriſts Inſtitution*] could not be *Accidental*, yet [the *Acknowledgment*] that is, the *Opinion* or *aſſerting* of it may. If the Church by miſtake ſhould think that to be Eſſential to it which is not, though it will not thence follow that its *Eſſence* is but an *Accident*, yet it will follow that both the *falſe opinion*, and the *thing it ſelf* ſo falſly conceited to be eſſential, are but accidents, or not eſſential. You ſay [*It cannot be meant of any Accidental thing*] But 1. That Meaning it ſelf of theirs may be an Accident. 2. And the queſtion is not what they [*Mean*, that is, *Imagine or affirm*] it to be; But what *it is* in deed and truth. That may *be an Accident*, which they think to be none.

2. But that which you ſay [*all the world knows*] is a thing that [*all the world of Chriſtians except your ſelves*,] that ever I heard of, do know, or acknowledge to be falſe. What! doth all the world know that Chriſt hath inſtituted in his Church

nothing but what is eſſential to it? I ſhould hope that few in the Chriſtian world would be ſo ignorant as ever to have ſuch a thought, if they had the means of knowledge that Proteſtants would have them have. There is no natural body but hath natural Accidents as well as Eſſence: Nor is there any other ſociety under heaven (*Community or Policy*) that hath not its Accidents as well as Eſſence: And yet hath Chriſt inſtituted, *a Church* that hath nothing but *Eſſence* without *Accidents*? Do you build upon ſuch foundations? What! upon the denyal of common principles and ſence? But if you did, you ſhould not have feigned all the world to do ſo too. Were your aſſeriton true, then every ſoul were cut off from the Church, and ſo from ſalvation, that wanted any thing of Chriſts Inſtitution, yea for a moment. And then what would become of you. You give me an inſtance in [*the Euchariſt*] But 1. Will it follow that if the *Euchariſt* be not Accidental or integral, but Eſſential, that therefore *every thing Inſtituted* by Chriſt is Eſſentiall? ſurely no? 2. The Queſtion being not whether the Being of the Euchariſt in the Church be Eſſential to the Univerſal Church: But whether

whether the *Belief* or *Acknowledgment* of it by All and every one of the members, be Eſſential to the Members? I would crave your anſwer but to this Queſtion (though it be nothing to my cauſe.) Was not a Baptized perſon in the primitive and ancient Churches a true Church-member, preſently upon Baptiſm? And then tell me alſo, Did not the ancient Fathers and Churches unanimouſly hide from their Catechumens, even *purpoſely hide*, the myſterie of the Euchariſt, as proper to the Church to underſtand? and never opened it to the auditors, till they were Baptized? This is moſt undenyable in the concurrent vote of the ancients. I think therefore that it follows that in the Judgement of the ancient Churches the Euchariſt was but of the Integrity, and not the Eſſence of a member of the Church; and the acknowledgement of it by all the members, a thing that never was exiſtent.

Where you ſay, your *Major ſhould have been granted or denyed without theſe diſtinctions*: I Reply, 1. If you mean fairly, and not to abuſe the truth by Confuſion, ſuch diſtinctions as you your ſelf call [*Learned and ſubſtantial*] can do you no wrong. They do but ſecure our true underſtanding

of one another: And a few lines in the beginning by way of diſtinction are not vain, that may prevent much vain altercation afterwards. When I once underſtand you, I have done: And I beſeech you, take it not for an injury to be underſtood.

As to your concluſion, that you *uſed no fallacy ex Accidente*, and *that my inſtances are not appoſite*; I Reply, thats the very life of the Controverſie between us: And our *main Queſtion* is not ſo to be *begged*. On the grounds I have ſhewed you, I ſtill averr, that [*the holding of the Papacy is as Accidental to the univerſal Church, as a Cancer in the breaſt is to a woman*;] And though you *ſay*, *It is Eſſential*, and *of Chriſts Inſtitution*, that *maketh* it neither Eſſential, nor of Chriſts Inſtitution; nor doth it make all his inſtitutions to be eſſentialls.

Now of your ſecond Syllogiſm. 1. I ſhall never queſtion the ſucceſſive Viſibility of the Church.

Whereas I told you out of your *Franſc. à S. Clara*, that many or moſt of your own Schoolmen agree not to that which you ſay [*All Chriſtians agree to*,] you make *no reply to it*.

As to your Minor, I have given you the Reaſons

ſons of the neceſſity and harmleſneſs of my diſtinctions: we need ſay no more to that [*a Congregation of Chriſtians*] and [*a Church*] are Synonima: But the word [*true*] was not added to your firſt term by you or me; and therefore your inſtance here is deluſory. But to ſay [*whatſoever Congregation of Chriſtians, is now the true Church*] is all one as to ſay *whatſoever Church of Chriſtians is now the true Church.*] When I know your meaning I have my end.

Though my ſyllogiſm ſay not that [*the Church of Rome acknowledgeth thoſe things alwaies done, and that by Chriſts inſtitution*] it nevertheleſs explicateth the weakneſs of yours, as to the fallacy *accidentis*: For 1. The holding it *alwaies done*, and that *of* Chriſts *Inſtitution*, may be either an Accident, or but of the Integrity, and *ad bene eſſe*, yea poſſibly an errour. 2. And I might as eaſily have given you Inſtances of that kind.

To your 3. Syllogiſm I Reply. 1. When you ſay the Church [*had Paſtors*] as you muſt ſpeak of what *exiſted*, (and Univerſalls exiſt not of themſelves) ſo it is neceſſary that I tell you, How far I grant your Minor, and how far I deny it.

My argument from the Indians and others, is not ſolved by you. For 1. You

can never prove that the Pope was preached to the Iberians by the Captive maid, nor to the Indians by *Frumentius*. 2. Thouſands were made Chriſtians and baptized by the Apoſtles, without any preaching or profeſſion of a papacy, *Act.* 2. *& paſſim.* 3. The Indians now Converted in *America* by the Engliſh and Dutch, hear nothing of the Pope, nor thouſands in *Ethiopia.* 4. Your own do or may baptize many without their owning the Pope, who yet would be Chriſtians. And a Paſtor not known, or believed, or owned, is actually no Paſtor to them.

To your confirmation, I Reply: You miſread my words: I talk not of [*Inviſible.*] I ſay it is true that the Univerſal Church is united to Chriſt as their univerſall Head: and is Viſible 1. In the members. 2. In the Profeſſion. 3. Chriſt himſelf is viſible in the Heavens, and as much *ſeen* of moſt of the Church as the Pope is, that is, *not at all.* As the Pope is not Inviſible, though one of a million ſee him not, no more is Chriſt, who is ſeen by moſt of the Church, and by the beſt part, even by the glorified. You know my meaning: Whether you will Call Chriſt viſible or not, I leave to you: I think he is viſible: But that

that which I affirm, is, that the univerſal Church hath no other viſible univerſal Head or Paſtor: But particular Churches have their particular Paſtors all under Chriſt.

Of *Eph.* 4. I eaſily grant that the whole Church may be ſaid to have Paſtors, in that all the particular Churches have Paſtors. But I deny that the whole have any one univerſal Paſtor but Chriſt. Of that which is the point in controverſie, you bring no proof. If you mean no more then I grant, that the whole Church hath Paſtors both in that each particular Church hath Paſtors, and in that unfixed Paſtors are to preach to all as they have opportunity, then your Minor hath no denyall from me.

Inſtead of proſecuting your Argument, when you had caſt the work of an Opponent upon me, you here appeal [*to any true Logician or expert Lawyer*] Content; I admit of your Appeal. But why then did you at all put on the face of an Opponent? could you not without this loſt labour at firſt have called me to prove the ſucceſſive viſiblity of our Church? But to your Appeal, *Ho all you true Logicians, this Learned man and I refer it to your tribunal,*

whether it be the part of an Opponent, to contrive his Argument ſo as that the Negative ſhall be his, and then change places, and become Reſpondent, and make his adverſary Opponent at his Pleaſure.] We leave this cauſe at your bar, and expect your ſentence.

But before we come to the Lawyers bar, I muſt have leave more plainly to ſtate our caſe.

We are all agreed that Chriſtianity is the true Religion, and Chriſt the Churches Univerſal Head; and the holy Scriptures the Word of God. Papiſts tell us of another Head and Rule; the Pope and Tradition, and judgement of the Church. Proteſtants deny theſe *Additionals*, and hold to *Chriſtianity* and *Scripture only*; *Our Religion*, being nothing but *Chriſtianity*, we have no Controverſie about: *Their Papall Religion*, *ſuperadded*, is that which is Controverted: They affirm 1. the *Right*. 2. the *Antiquity* of it: We deny both: The *Right* we *diſprove* from *Scripture*, though it belongs to them to *prove* it. The *Antiquity* is it that is now to be referred. Proteſtancy being the Denyall of Popery, it is *we* that *Really* have the *Negative*, and the *Papiſts* that have the *Affirmative*. The

Eſſence

Eſſence of our Church (which is *Chriſtian*) is confeſſed to have been ſucceſſively viſible: But *we* deny that *theirs* as Papal hath been ſo; and now they tell us, that it is *Eſſential* to ours to deny the ſucceſſion of *theirs*, and therefore require us to prove a ſucceſſion of ours, as one that ſtill hath *denyed theirs*: Now we leave our caſe to the Lawyers, ſeeing to them you make your appeal, 1. Whether the ſubſtance of all our cauſe lie not in this Queſtion, *Whether the Papacy or univerſal Government by the Pope, be of heaven, or of men?* and ſo *whether it hath been from the beginning?* which *we deny*, and therefore are called *Proteſtants*; and *they affirm*, and are therefore called *Papiſts*. 2. If they cannot *firſt prove* a *ſucceſſive viſibility* of their *Papacy* and Papal Church, then what Law can bind us to prove that it was *denied*, before it did *ariſe* in the world, or ever any pleaded for it? 3. And as to the point of Poſſeſſion, I know not what can be pretended on your ſide. 1. The Poſſeſſion of this or that particular Pariſh Church or Tythes, is not the thing in queſtion; but the *univerſal Headſhip* is the thing: But if it were, yet it is I that am yet here in Poſſeſſion; and Proteſtants before me for many ages ſucceſſively:

ceſſively: And when poſſeſſed you the Headſhip of the *Ethiopian*, *Indian*, and other extra-imperial Churches? never to this day. No nor of the Eaſtern Churches, though you had communion with them. 2. If the Queſtion be, who hath Poſſeſſion of the *univerſal Church*; we pretend not to it; but only to be a part, and the ſoundeſt ſafeſt part. 3. The caſe of Poſſeſſion therefore is, whether we have not been longer in Poſſeſſion of our Religion, which is bare Chriſtianity, then you of your ſuperadded Popery. Our Poſſeſſion is not denied, of Chriſtianity. Yours of Popery we deny: (and our denyal makes us called Proteſtants): Let therefore the reaſon of Logicians, Lawyers, or any rational ſober man determine the caſe, whether it do not firſt and principally belong to you, to prove the viſible ſucceſſion of a Vice-Chriſt over the univerſal Church.

As to your contradictory impoſitions I Reply, 1. Your exception was not expreſt, and your impoſition was peremptory. 2. I told you I would be a Papiſt if you prove [*that the whole viſible Church in all ages hath held the Popes univerſal headſhip*] you ſay that you [*have proved it by this argument, that either he hath that ſupremacy,*

or

or ſome other Church; denying that he hath alwaies had it, hath been alwaies viſible,] and that Church you require ſhould be named. I Reply, 1. Had not you deſpaired of making good your cauſe, you ſhould have gone on by Argumentation, till you had forced me to contradict ſome common principle. 2. If you ſhould ſhew theſe Papers to the world, and tell them that you have no better proof of the ſucceſſion of your Papacy, then that we prove not that it hath alwaies been denied by the viſible Church, you would ſure turn thouſands from Popery, if there be ſo many rational conſidering impartial men that would peruſe them, and believe you. For any man may know that it could not be expected that the Churches ſhould deny a Vice-Chriſt before he was ſprung up. Why did not all the precedent *Roman* Biſhops diſclaim the title of *univerſal Biſhop or Patriarch*, till *Pelagius* and *Gregory*? but becauſe there was none in the world that gave occaſion for it. How ſhould any Hereſie be oppoſed or condemned before it doth ariſe?

But you fairly yield me ſomewhat here, and ſay that you [*oblige me not to prove a continued viſible Church formally and expreſly*

preſly denying it; but that it was of ſuch a conſtitution as was inconſiſtent with any ſuch ſupremacy, or could and did ſubſiſt without it.] *Reply*, I confeſs your firſt part is very ingenuous and fair. Remember it hereafter, that you have diſcharged me from proving [*a Church that denied the Papacy formally & expreſly.*] But as to what you yet demand. 1. I have here given it you, becauſe you ſhall not ſay I'le fail you: I have anſwered your deſire. But 2. It is not as a thing neceſſary, but *ex abundanti*, as an overplus. For you may now ſee plainly, that to prove that the Church was without an univerſal Paſtor, (which you require) is to prove the Negative, *viz.* that then there *was none ſuch*; whereas its you that muſt prove that there *was ſuch*. I prove our Religion: do you prove yours: though I ſay to pleaſure you, I'le diſprove it, and have done it in two books already.

My reaſon from the ſtreſs of neceſſity, which you lay on your Affirmative and Additions, was but ſubſervient to the foregoing *Reaſons*, not *firſt* to prove you *bound*, but to prove you the *more bound* to the proof of your Affirmative. And therefore your inſtance of Mahumetans is impertinent. He that ſaith, you ſhall be damned if

if you believe not this or that, is *more obliged* to prove it, then he that affirmeth a point as of no ſuch moment.

To what I ſay of an *accident* and a *corrupt part*, you *ſay you have anſwered*, and do *but ſay ſo*, having ſaid nothing to it that is conſiderable.

Me thinks you that make Chriſt to be corporally preſent in every Church in the Euchariſt, ſhould not ſay, that the King of the Church is *abſent*. But when you have proved, 1. That Chriſt is ſo abſent from his Church, that there's need of a Deputy to eſſentiate his Kingdom, and 2. That the Pope is ſo *Deputed*; you will have done more then is yet done for your cauſe. And yet let me tell you, that in the abſence of a King, it is only the King and Subjects that are eſſential to the Kingdom. The Deputy is but an officer, and not eſſential.

Your *naked aſſertion*, that *whatſoever Government Chriſt inſtituteth, of his Church, muſt be eſſential to his Church*, is no proof, nor like the task of an Opponent. The Government of inferiour officers is not eſſential to the univerſal Church, no more then Judges and Juſtices to a Kingdom. And yet we muſt wait long before you will

prove

prove that *Peter* and the Pope of *Rome* are in Chriſts place, as Governours of the univerſal Church.

Sir, I deſire open dealing, as between men that believe theſe matters are of eternal conſequence. I watch not for any advantage againſt you. Though it be your part to prove the Affirmative which our Negative ſuppoſeth; yet I have begun the proof of our Negative; but it was on ſuppoſition that you will equally now prove your Affirmative, better then you have here done. I have proved a viſible Church ſucceſſively that *held not* the Popes univerſal Government: do you now prove [*that the univerſal Church in all ages did hold the Popes univerſal Government*] which is your part; or I muſt ſay again, I ſhall think you do but run away, and give up your cauſe as unable to defend it: I have not failed you; do not you fail me.

You complain of a deficiency in quality, though you confeſs that I abound in number. But where is the defect! you ſay, I muſt [*aſſert both that theſe were one Congregation, and ever viſible ſince Chriſts time*] *Reply*, If by [*one Congregation*] you meant [*one aſſembly met for perſonal Communion*] which

which is the *firſt ſenſe* of the word [*Congregation*] it were ridiculous to feign the univerſal Church to be ſuch. If you mean, *One as united in one viſible humane Head*, thats it that we deny, and therefore may not be required to prove. But that theſe Churches are *One as united in Chriſt the Head*, we eaſily prove; In that from him *the whole family is named*; the *body is Chriſts body*, 1 Cor. 12. 12, 13. *and one in him*, Eph. 4. 4, 5, 6, *&c.* All that are true Chriſtians are one Kingdom or Church of Chriſt; but theſe of whom I ſpeak are true Chriſtians; therefore they are one Kingdom or Church of Chriſt. And that they have been viſible ſince Chriſts time till now, all hiſtory, even your own affirms: As in *Judea*, & from the Apoſtles times, in *Ethiopia*, *Egypt* and other parts, (*Rome* was no Church in the time of Chriſts being on earth.) And to what purpoſe talk you of *determinate Congregations*? Do you mean individual aſſemblies? thoſe ceaſe when the perſons die; or do you mean aſſemblies meeting in the ſame place? ſo they have not done ſtill at *Rome*. I told you, and tell you ſtill, that we hold not that God hath ſecured the perpetual viſibility of his Church in any one City or Country: but if it ceaſe in one

place,

place, it is ſtill in others. It may ceaſe at *Epheſus*, at *Philippi*, *Coloſſe*, &c. in *Tenduc*, *Nubia*, &c. and yet remain in other parts. I never ſaid that the Church *muſt needs* be viſible ſtill in one Town or Country. And yet it *hath been ſo de facto*, as in *Aſia*, *Ethiopia*, &c. But you ſay, *I nominate none.* Are you ſerious! muſt I *nominate* Chriſtians of theſe Nations, to prove that there were ſuch? you require not this of the Church Hiſtorians. It ſufficeth that they tell you, that *Ethiopia*, *Egypt*, *Armenia*, *Syria*, &c. had Chriſtians, without naming them. When all hiſtory tells you that theſe Countries were Chriſtians, or had Churches, I muſt tell you [*what and who they were*]! muſt you have their names, ſirnames, and Genealogies? I cannot name you one of a thouſand in this ſmall Nation, in the age I live in: How then ſhould I name you the people of *Armenia*, *Abaſſia*, &c. ſo long ago? You can name but few of the *Roman* Church in each age: And had they wanted learning and records as much as the Abaſſins and Indians, and others, you might have been as much to ſeek for names as they. You ask [*were they different Congregations?*] *Anſw.* As united in Chriſt they were *one Church*: but as aſſembling at

at one time, or in one place, or under the ſame guide, ſo they were *not one*, but divers Congregations.

That there were any Papiſts of 400. years after Chriſt, do you prove if you are able.

My concluſion, that *all have been againſt you for many hundred years*, muſt ſtand good, till you prove that ſome were for you: yet I have herewith proved that there were none, at leaſt that could deſerve the name of the Church.

Do you think to ſatisfie any reaſonable man by calling for poſitive proof from Authors, of ſuch Negatives? yet proof you ſhall not want, ſuch as the nature of the point requireth, *viz.* That the ſaid Churches of *Ethiopia*, *India*, the outer *Armenia*, and other extra-imperial Nations, were not under the juriſdiction of the Biſhop of *Rome*. 1. You find all theſe Churches, or moſt of them at this day (that remain) from under your juriſdiction: and you cannot tell us when or how they turned from you. If you could, it had been done. 2. Theſe Nations profeſs it to be their Tradition, that the Pope was never their Governour. 3. No hiſtory or authority of the leaſt regard, is brought by your own writers to prove theſe Churches

under your juriſdiction: no not by *Baronius* himſelf, that is ſo copious, and ſo skilful in making much of nothing. No credible witneſſes mention your Acts of juriſdiction over them, or their Acts of ſubjection, which Church hiſtory muſt needs have contained, if it had been true, that they were your ſubjects. 4. Their abſence from general Councils, and no invitation of them thereunto, (that was ever proved, or is ſhewed by you) is ſufficient evidence. 5. Their Liturgies, even the moſt ancient, bear no footſteps of any ſubjection to you. Though your forgeries have corrupted them: as I ſhall here (digreſſively) give one inſtance of: The Ethiopick Liturgy, becauſe of a [*Hoc eſt corpus meum*] which we alſo uſe, is urged to prove that they are for the corporal preſence, or Tranſubſtantiation: But ſaith *Uſher*, *de ſucceſſ. Eccleſ. In Ethiopicarum Eccleſiarum univerſali Canone, deſcriptum habebatur* [*Hic panis eſt corpus meum*]: *In Latina tranſlatione contra fidem Ethiopic. Exemplarium* (*ut in prima operis editione confirmat Pontificius ipſe Scholiaſtes*) *expunctum eſt nomen* [*Panis.*] 6. *Conſtantines* Letters of requeſt to the King of *Perſia* for the Churches there (which *Euſeb. in vit. Conſtant.* mentioneth) do

do intimate that then the *Roman* Biſhop ruled not there. 7. Even at home, the Scots and Brittains obeyed not the Pope, nor conformed about the Eaſter obſervation, even in the daies of *Gregory*; but reſiſted his changes, and refuſed communion with his Miniſters. 8. I have already elſewhere given you the teſtimony of ſome of your own writers: as *Reynerius contra Waldenſ. Catal. in Biblioth. Patr. Tom.* 4. *p.* 773. ſaying [*The Churches of the Armenians, and Ethiopians, and Indians, and the reſt which the Apoſtles converted, are not under the Church of* Rome.] 9. I have proved from the Council of *Chalcedon*, that it was the Fathers, that is, the Councils that gave *Rome* its preheminence: But thoſe Councils gave the Pope no preheminence over the extra-imperial Nations: For 1. Thoſe Nations being not called to the Council, could not be bound by it. 2. The Emperours called and enforced the Councils, who had no power out of their Empire. 3. The Dioceſs are deſcribed and expreſly confined within the verge of the Empire; ſee both the deſcription, and full proof in *Blondel de Primatu in Eccleſia. Gall.* And 10. The Emperours themſelves did ſometime (giveing power to the Councils Acts) make

Rome the chief; and ſometime (as the Councils did alſo) give *Conſtantinople* equal priviledge; and ſometime ſet *Conſtantinople* higheſt, as I have ſhewed in my *Key*, p. 174, 175. But the Emperours had no power to do thus with reſpect to thoſe without the Empire.

But what ſay you now to the contrary? Why 1. You ask, [*Were thoſe Primitive Chriſtians of another kind of Church order and Government then were thoſe under the* Roman *Empire?*] *Anſw.* When the whole body of Church hiſtory ſatisfieth us that they were not ſubject to the Pope, which is the thing in queſtion, is it any weakening of ſuch evidence in a matter of ſuch publick fact, to put ſuch a queſtion as this, *Whether they were under another kind of Government?* 1. We know that they were under Biſhops or Paſtors of their own: and ſo far their Government was of the ſame kind. 2. If any of them, or all, did ſuit their Church aſſociations to the ſeveral Commonwealths in which they lived, and ſo held National Councils, and for order ſake made one among them the Biſhop *primæ ſedis*, then was that Government of the ſame kind with that of the Imperial Churches, and not of another kind. The *Roman* Government was

was no other, but *One*, thus *Ordered*, in *one Empire*: And if there were alſo *One*, ſo ordered, in *England*, *one in Scotland*, *one in Ethiopia*, &c. this was of the *ſame kind* with the *Roman*. Every Church ſuited to the form of the Common-wealth, is even (as to that humane mode) of the ſame kind (if a humane mode muſt be called a *Kind.*) It may be of that ſame kind, and mode, without being part of the ſame *Individual.*

But 2. You ſay that [*How far from truth this is, appeareth from St.* Leo *in his Sermons* de Natali ſuo, *where he ſayes*, [Sedes Roma Petri; quicquid non poſſidet armis, Religione tenet.] *Reply*, If you take your Religion on truſt, as you do your authorities that are made your ground of it, and bring others to it when you are deceived your ſelves, how will you look Chriſt in the the face when you muſt anſwer for ſuch temerity? *Leo* hath no Sermons *de Natali ſuo*, but only one Sermon affixed to his Sermons, lately found in an old book of *Nicol. Fabers.* And in that Sermon there is no ſuch words as you here alledge. Neither doth he Poetize in his Sermons, nor there hath any ſuch words which might occaſion your miſtake: and therefore

doubtleſs you believed ſome body for this that told you an untruth; and yet ventured to make it the ground of charging my words with untruth. Yet let me tell you, that I will take Pope *Leo* for no competent judge or witneſs, though you call him a Saint: as long as we know what paſt between him and the Council of *Chalcedon*, and that he was one of the firſt tumified Biſhops of *Rome*, he ſhall not be judge in his own cauſe.

3. But you add that [*The Abaſſines of* Ethiopia *were under the Patriarch of* Alexandria *anciently, and he under the authority of the* Roman *Biſhop.*] *Reply.* 1. Your bare word without proof ſhall not perſwade us that the Abaſſines were under the Patriarch of *Alexandria* for above three hundred, if not four hundred years after Chriſt. Prove it, and then your words are regardable. 2. At the Council of *Nice* the contrary is manifeſt by the ſixth Can. [*Mos antiquus perdurat in Ægypto, vel Lybia & Pentapoli, ut Alexandrinus Epiſcopus horum omnium habeat poteſtatem*, &c.] And the common deſcriptions of the Alexandrian Patriarchate in thoſe times confine it to the Empire, and leave out *Æthiopia* (*Piſanus* new inventions we regard not.) 3. I de-

ny

ny that the Patriarch of *Alexandria* was under the Government of the Biſhop of *Rome*, any more then the Jury are under the Foremen, or the junior Juſtices on the bench are under the ſenior, or *York* is under *London*, or the other Earls of *England* are under the Earl of *Arundel*. 4. But if both theſe were proved, that *Ethiopia* was under *Alexandria*, and *Alexandria* under *Rome*, I deny the conſequence, that *Ethiopia* was under *Rome*: for *Alexandria* was under *Rome* but *ſecundum quid*, and ſo far as it was within the Empire, and therefore thoſe without the Empire that were under *Alexandria*, were not therefore under *Rome*. 5. And if it could (as it never can) be proved of *Abaſſia*, what is that to all the other Churches in *India*, *Perſia*, and the reſt of the world? Sir, If you have impartially read the ancient Church hiſtory, and yet can believe that all theſe Churches were then under the Pope, deſpair not of bringing your ſelf to believe any thing imaginable that you would have to be true.

3. Your next queſtion is [*When the* Roman *Emperours were yet Heathens, had not the Biſhops of* Rome *the ſupremacy over all other Biſhops through the whole Church?*] *Anſw.* No: they had not; nor in the

Empire neither. Prove it, I beſeech you, better then by queſtioning. If you askt, *Whether men rule not Angels?* your Queſtion proves not the Affirmative.

4. But you ask again [*Did thoſe Heathen Emperours give it him?*] *Anſw.* 1. *Power* over all Churches none ever gave him, till titularly his own Paraſites of late. 2. *Primacy* of meer degree in the Empire, for the dignity and many advantages of the Emperial ſeat, the Biſhops of the Empire gave him by conſent (*Blondel de primatu*, gives you the proof and reaſon at large:) yet ſo as that [*ſmall regard was had to the Church of* Rome *before the Nicene Council*] as ſaith your *Æneas Sylvius*, Pope *Pius* the ſecond.

5. [*Whether the Biſhop of* Rome *had power over the Biſhop of* Arles *by Heathen Emperours,*] is a frivolous queſtion. *Arles* was in the *Roman* Patriarchate, and not out of the Empire. The Churches in the Empire, might by conſent diſpoſe themſelves into the Patriarchal orders, without the Emperours, and yet not meddle out of the Empire. Yet indeed *Cyprians* words intimate no power *Rome* had over *Arles*, more then *Arles* had over *Rome*: that is, to reject communion with each other upon

diſſent.

diſſent. Nay it more confuteth you, that even under Heathen Emperours, when Church aſſociations were by voluntary conſent of Paſtors only; and ſo if they had thought it neceſſary, they might have extended them to other Principalities: yet *de facto* they did not do it, as all hiſtory of the Church declareth, mentioning their Councils and aſſociations, without theſe taken in.

See now how little your objections are worth; and how groundleſly you bid me [*See now how little my allegations are to the purpoſe.*]

As for the rabble of Hereticks which you reckon up, (as you eſteem them,) ſome of them are no Chriſtians univocally ſo called, and thoſe cannot be of the Chriſtian Church. Others of them were better Chriſtians then the Romaniſts, and ſo were of the ſame Church with us: And it is not many reproachfull names put on them by malice that makes them no Chriſtians, or of many Churches or Religions. If an arrogant uſurper will put nick-names on all that will not bow to him as the Vice-Chriſt, and call them Iconoclaſts, Berengarians, Waldenſians, Albigenſes, Wicklefiſts, Huſſites, Lutherans, Calviniſts (you may as well

give

give them a thouſand more names) this makes them not of various Religions, nor blots out their names from the book of life. I have in my moſt retired thoughts peruſed the Hiſtory of thoſe mens lives, and of the lives of many of your Popes, together with their ſeverall doctrines; and with death and judgement in my eyes, as before the great God of Heaven, I humbly beg of him, that I may rather have my everlaſting portion with thoſe holy men whom you burned, as Waldenſes, Albigenſes, Huſſites, *&c.* then with the Popes that burned them, or thoſe that follow them in that cruelty, unleſs reconciling grace have given them repentance unto life. The Religion of all theſe men was one, and they were all of one univerſall Church.

Where you again call for *One Congregation*, I tell you again that we know no *Unity* eſſentiall, from whence the Church can be called one, but either Chriſt or the Vice-Chriſt: the former only is aſſerted by us, and the latter alſo by you, which we deny: And therefore we cannot call the univerſall *Church One*, in any other formal reſpects, but as it is *Chriſtian*, and ſo *One* in Chriſt. Yet have I herewith ſatisfied your demand, but ſhewed you the unreaſonableneſs of

it,

it, beyond all reaſonable contradiction.

You next enquire *whether* [*we account* Rome *and us One Congregation of Chriſtians?*] I anſwer, the Roman Church hath *two Heads*, and ours *but one*, and thats the difference. They are Chriſtians, and ſo *One* Church as united in Chriſt, with us and all other true Chriſtians. If any ſo hold their Papacy and other errours as effectively and practically to deſtroy their Chriſtianity, thoſe are not Chriſtians, and ſo not of the ſame Church as we. But thoſe that do not ſo, but are ſo Papiſts, as yet to be truly and practically Chriſtians, are and ſhall be of the ſame Church with us, whether they will or not: And your modeſt ſtile makes me hope that you and I are of one Church, though you never ſo much renounce it. As *Papall*, we are not of your Church; thats a new Church form; But as Chriſtian, we are and will be of it, even when you are condemning, torturing and burning us (if ſuch perſecution can ſtand with your Chriſtianity.)

But you aske [*Why did you then ſeparate your ſelves, and remain ſtill ſeparate from the Communion of the Roman Church.*] Anſw. 1. We never ſeparated from you as you

you are Chriſtians; We ſtill remain of that Church as Chriſtian, and we know (or will know) no other form; becauſe that Scripture and primitive Churches knew no other. Either you have by Popery ſeparated from the Church as Chriſtian, or not; If you have, its you that are the (damnable) Separatiſts. If you have not, then we are not ſeparated from you, in reſpect of the form of the Chriſtian Church. And for your *other form* (the Papacy) 1. Neither I, nor my Grand-father, or great grand-father did ſeparate from it: becauſe they never entertained it. 2. Thoſe that did ſo, did but Repent of their ſin, and thats no ſin. We ſtill remain ſeparated from you as Papiſts, even as we are ſeparate from ſuch as we are commanded to avoid, for impenitency in ſome corrupting doctrine or ſcandalous ſin; Whether ſuch mens ſins or their profeſſed Chriſtianity be moſt predominant at the heart, we know not: but till they ſhew Repentance we muſt avoid them; yet admoniſhing them as brethren, and not taking them as men of another Church, but as finding them unfit for our Communion.

But O ſir, what manner of dealing have we from you! muſt we be impriſoned, rackt,

rackt, hang'd or burn'd, if we will not believe that bread & wine, are not bread and wine, contrary to our own and all mens ſenſes; and if we will not worſhip them with Divine worſhip, and will not obey the Pope of *Rome* in all ſuch matters contrary to our Conſciences: and then muſt we be chidden for ſeparating from you, if we can [illegible] a while eſcape the ſtrappado and the [illegible]es? What! will you blame us for not believing that all mens ſenſes are deceived, and the greater part of Chriſtians and their Traditions (againſt you) are falſe, when we read, and ſtudy, and ſuſpect our ſelves, and pray for light, and are willing to hear any of your reaſons, but cannot force our own underſtandings to believe all ſuch things that you believe, and meerly becauſe the Pope commands it: and when we cannot thus force our own underſtandings, muſt we be burned, or elſe called *Separatiſts*? would you have the *Communion of our Aſhes*, or elſe ſay, *We forſake your Communion*? In your Churches we cannot have leave to come, without lying againſt God and our conſciences, and ſaying, *We believe* what our *ſenſes contradict*; and without committing that which our conſciences tell us are moſt heynous ſins. We ſolemnly proteſt that we

we would do as you do, and ſay as you ſay, were it not for the love of truth and holineſs, and for fear of the wrath of God, and the flames of hell: but we cannot, we dare not ruſh upon theſe errours, and ſell our ſouls to pleaſe the Pope. And muſt we then either be *murdered*, or *taken for uncharitable*? will you ſay to ſo many poor ſouls, that are ready to enter into another world [*Either ſin againſt your conſciences, and ſo damn your ſouls, or elſe let us burn and murder you, or elſe you do not love us; you are uncharitable if you deny us leave to kill you, and you ſeparate from the Communion of the Church.*] We appeal from the Pope and all unreaſonable men, to the great God of heaven and earth, to judge righteouſly between you and us concerning this dealing.

As for poſſeſſing our ſelves of your Biſhopricks and Cures, if any particular perſon had perſonal injury in the change, being caſt out without cauſe, they muſt anſwer for it that did it, and not I: though I never heard any thing to make me believe it. But muſt the Prince and people let alone delinquent Paſtors for fear of being blamed for taking their Biſhopricks? Miniſters of the ſame Religion with us may be caſt

caſt out for their crimes: Princes have power over Paſtors as well as *David*, *Solomon*, and other Kings of *Iſrael* had. *Guil. Barklay* and ſome few of your own knew this. The Popes treaſonable exemption of the Clergy from their Soveraigns judgement, will not warrant thoſe Princes before God, that neglect to puniſh offending Paſtors. And I beſeech you tell us, when our conſciences (after the uſe of all means that we can uſe to be informed) cannot renounce all our ſences, nor our reaſon, nor the judgement of the moſt of the Church, or of antiquity, or the Word of God, and yet we muſt do ſo, or be no members of your Church, what wrong is it to you if we chooſe us Paſtors of our own, in the order that God hath appointed? Had not the people in all former ages the choice of their Paſtors? we and our late forefathers here were never under your overſight: but we know not why we may not now chooſe our Paſtors as well as formerly. We do it not by tumults: we kill not men, and tread not in their blood, while we chooſe our Paſtors, as Pope *Damaſus* was choſen. The tythes and other temporal maintenance we take from none, but the Magiſtrate diſpoſeth of it as he ſeeth meet for the Churches

Churches good. And the maintenance is for the cure or work: and therefore they that are justly cast out of the cure, are justly deprived of the maintenance. And surely when they are dead, none of you can with any shew of reason, stand up and say, *These Bishopricks are yours:* or *these Parsonages yours.* It is the Incumbent personally that only can claim title; saving the supereminent title of Christ, to whom they are devoted. But the successive Popes cannot have title to all the tithes and Temples in the world; nor any of his Clergy that never were called to the charges. If this be *disunion*, it is you that are the *Separatists* and cause of all. If you will needs tell all the Christian world, that except they will be ruled by the Pope of *Rome*, and be burned if they believe not as he bids them in despight of all their senses, he will call them Separatists, Schismaticks, and say they disunite and are uncharitable: again, we appeal to God and all wise men that are impartial, whether it be he or we that is the divider?

You ask me [*Is not charity, subordination, and obedience to the same state and Government, required as well to make one Congregation of Christians, as it is required to make a Con-*

Congregation of Commonwealths men ?]
Anſw. Yes, it is: But as all the world is one Kingdom under God the univerſal King, but yet hath no univerſal Vice-King, but every Commonwealth only hath its own Soveraign; even ſo all the Chriſtian world is one Church under Chriſt the univerſal King of the Church, but hath not one Vice-Chriſt, but every Church hath its own Paſtors, as every School hath its own Schoolmaſter. But all the anger is becauſe we are loth to be ruled by a cruel uſurper therefore we are uncharitable.

Your next reaſon againſt me, is, becauſe [*They cannot be parts of the Catholike Church, unleſs Arrians, and Pelagians, and Donatiſts be parts*] *and ſo Hereticks and Schiſmaticks be parts.*] *Reply* 1. You know ſure, that your own Divines are not agreed whether Hereticks and Schiſmaticks are parts of the Church. And if they were, yet it is not *de fide* with you, as not determined by the Pope. If it be, then all yours are Hereticks that are for the affirmative (*Bellarmine* nameth you ſome of them) If it be not, then how can you be ſure its true, and ſo impoſe it on me, that they are no parts.

2. Arrians are no Chriſtians, as denying that

that which is eſſential to Chriſt, and ſo to Chriſtianity. Pelagianiſm is a thing that you are not agreed among your ſelves of the true nature of. Many of the Dominicans and Janſeniſts think the Jeſuits Pelagianize, or Semipelagianize at leaſt. I hope you will not ſhut them out. Donatiſts were ſchiſmaticks, becauſe they divided *in* the Catholike Church, and not abſolutely *from* it: and becauſe they divided from the particular Churches about them that held the moſt univerſal external Communion. I think they were ſtill members of the univerſal Church: but I'le not contend with any that will plead for his uncharitable denyal. Its nothing to our caſe.

That the Æthiopians are Eutychian Hereticks, I will ſee better proved before I will believe it. *Roſſes* words I ſo little regard, that I will not ſo much as open his book to ſee whether he ſay ſo or not. I know that Hereſie is a perſonal crime, and cannot be charged on Nations, unleſs you have evidence that the Nations conſent to it: which here you have none: Some are called Hereticks for denying points eſſential to Chriſtianity: theſe are no Chriſtians, and ſo not in the Church: but many alſo are called Hereticks by you, and by the Fathers, for

for leſſer errors conſiſtent with Chriſtianity: and theſe may be in the Church. The Abaſſines, and all the reſt have not been yet tryed, and convicted before any competent Judge: and ſlanderers we regard not.

2. Many of your own writers acquit them of Hereſie, and ſay, the difference is now found to be but in words, or little more.

To what you ſay of their diſclaiming us, unleſs we take the Patriarch of *Conſtantinople* for the Vice-Chriſt; you many waies miſtake. 1. If this were true, that they rejected us, it were no proof that we are not of one univerſal Church. 2. They do not claim to be *Vice Chriſti*, the univerſal Governours of the Church: the title of univerſal Patriarch they extended but to the then *Roman* Empire; and that not to an univerſal *Government*, but *Primacy*. And many of them have been of brotherly charity to our Churches of late. *Cyril* I need not name to you, whom your party procured Murdered for being a Proteſtant. *Meletius* (firſt Patriarch of *Alexandria* and then of *Conſtantinople*) was highly offended with the fiction of a ſubmiſſion of the *Alexandrian* Church to *Rome*, (under a

counterfeit Patriarch-*Gabriels* name); and wrote thus of the Pope in his Letters to *Sigiſmund* King of *Poland An.* 1600. [*Perſpiceret Majeſtas tua, nos cum majoribus noſtris, non ignorare (quem precaris ut agnoſcamus) Pontificem ſcilicet Romanum veluti & Conſtantinopolitanum Pontificem, Pontificem Conſtant. Cæteroſque Apoſtolicarum ſedium Pontifices. Qui non unus omnium, ſed inter omnes & ipſe unus.——— Unum univerſale Caput, quod ſit D. N. Jeſus Chriſtus; alius eſſe non poſſit, niſi biceps aliquod ſit corpus, aut potius monſtrum corporis. Perſpiceres, Rex ſereniſſime, (ut interim de Concilio illo Florentino, veluti de re ſilentio digna taceam) non Nos, è Patria, tum Orientalium, tum Occidentalium dogmatibus traditionibuſque quæ per ſeptem univerſalia concilia nobis conſignarunt atque obſignarunt, egreſſos: Illos egreſſos, qui novitatibus in dies delectantur.*] in the ſame Letters he commendeth *Cyril.* And what can a Proteſtant ſay more againſt the Vice-Chriſtſhip, and your novelties?

And for *Jeremias* his predeceſſor, whom you mention, though they that diſputed with him by Letters (*Stephanus Gerlochius, & Martinus Cruſius*) did not agree in all things with him, yet he ſtill profeſſed his deſire

deſire of unity and concord with us, and in the beginning of his ſecond anſwer rejoyceth, that we agreed with them in ſo many things. And *Johan. Zygomalas* in his Letters to *Cruſius* 1576. *May* 15. ſaith, [*Perſpicuum tibi & omnibus futurum eſt, quod in continuis, & cauſam fidei præcipue continentibus articulis, conſentiamus: quæ autem videntur conſenſum inter vos & nos impedire, talia ſunt, ſi velit quis, ut facile ea corrigere poſſit.* ——— *Gaudium in cælo & ſuper terram erit, ſi coibit in unitatem utraque Eccleſia, & idem ſentiemus, & ſimul vivemus in omni concordia & pace ſecundum Deum & in ſinceræ charitatis vinculo.*]

But as it is not the Patriarch that is the whole Greek Church, ſo it is not their errors in ſome leſſer or tolerable points that prove us of two Churches or Religions.

Whereas you ſay, It is againſt all Antiquity and Chriſtianity to admit condemned Hereticks into the Church. I *Reply*, 1. I hate their condemnation, rather then reverence it, that (even being *non judices*) dare condemn whole Nations without hearing one man of them ſpeak for himſelf, or hearing one witneſs that ever heard them defend Hereſie; and this meerly becauſe ſome few Biſhops have in the daies

of old maintained Hereſie, and perhaps ſome may do ſo ſtill, or rather differ from you in words, while you miſunderſtand each other. Did I find ſuch errors with them as with you, yet I durſt charge them on no one man that I had not reaſon to hold guilty of them: I dare not accuſe whole Nations of your errors. But of all theſe things (and of *Sandys* words which you cite) I have ſpoken already in two Books, and in the latter fully proved that you differ in many points of faith, and greater things then you call Hereſies in others among your ſelves, even your Popes, Saints, and Councils, and yet neither part is judged by you to be out of the Church. See my *Key*, p. 124, 125, 127, 128, 129. p. 52. *ad* 62.

When you ſay ſo much to prove the *Greeks guilty of manifeſt Hereſie*, and pretend that *it is but ſome novel writers of ours that deny it, as forced by your arguments.*] I muſt ſay, that you prove but your own uncharitableneſs inſtead of their Hereſie: and you ſhew your ſelf a ſtranger to your own writers, who frequently excuſe the Greeks from Hereſie, and ſay the difference at the Council of *Florence* was found to be more about words then faith. *Thomas à*

Jeſus

Jeſu de Converſ. omn. gentium, lib. 6. cap. 8. p. 281. ſaith, [*His tamen non obſtantibus alii opinantur Græcos tantum eſſe ſchiſmaticos: Ita ex junioribus docet Pater Azorius* 1. *primæ Inſtitut. Moral. lib.* 8. *cap.* 20. *q.* 10. *Quare merito ab Eccleſia Catholica non hæretici, ſed ſchiſmatici cenſentur & appellantur: Ita apertè inſinuat* D. *Bernardus* (no Novel Proteſtant) *in Epiſt. ad Eugenium, lib.* 3. [*Ego addo* (inquit) *de pertinacia Græcorum qui nobiſcum ſunt, & non ſunt: junctifide, pace diviſi; quanquam & in fide ipſa claudicaverint à rectis ſemitis.*] *Idem apertè tenet* D. *Thomas Opuſcul.* 2. *ubi docet patres Græcos in Catholico ſenſu eſſe exponendos. Ratio hujus Opinionis eſt quoniam ut prædictus author docet, in prædictis fidei articulis, de quibus Græci accuſantur ab aliquibus ut hæretici, potius Nomine, quam Re ab Eccleſia Romana diſſident. Inprimis inficiantur illi Spiritum Sanctum à Patre Filioque procedere ut in Bulla Unionis Eugenii* 4. *dicitur, exiſtimantes Latinos ſentire à Patre Filioque procedere tanquam à duobus principiis; cum tamen Latina doceat Eccleſia procedere à duabus perſonis tanquam ab uno principio & ſpiratore; quare Græci ut unum principium ſignificent, dicunt Spiritum Sanctum à Patre per Filium procedere ab omni æternitate.*]

Your *Paulus Veridicus* (*Paul Harris* Dean of your Academy lately in *Dublin*) in his Confutation of Biſhop *Vſhers* Sermon, ſaith that the Greeks Doctrine about the Proceſſion of the Holy Ghoſt *à Patre per Filium*, and not *à Patre Filioque*, was ſuch that [*When they had explicated it, they were found to believe very Orthodoxly and Catholikely in the ſame matter, and for ſuch were admitted*] and that [*He findeth not any ſubſtantial point that they differ from you in, but the Primacy*] (So the Armenians were received in the ſame Council of *Florence*.) Many more I have read of your own writers that all vindicate the Greeks (and others that diſown you) from Hereſie, I think more then I have read of Proteſtants that do it. And do you think now that it is not a diſgrace to your cauſe, that a man of your learning, and one that I hear hath the confidence to draw others to your opinions, ſhould yet be ſo unacquainted with the opinions of your own Divines, and upon this miſtake ſo confidently feign that it is *our Novel writers forced to it by your arguments* that have been ſo charitable to theſe Churches againſt antiquity that knew better? If the Greeks and Latins tear the Church of Chriſt by their Condemnations

tions of each other, they may *both be ſchiſmatical*, as guilty of making *diviſions in the Church*, though not as *dividing from the Church*. And if they pretend the denyal of the Chriſtian faith againſt each other as the cauſe, you ſhall not draw us into the guilt of the uncharitableneſs, by telling us that they *know better then we*. If wiſe men fall out and fight, I will not juſtifie either ſide, becauſe they are wiſe and therefore likelier then I to know the cauſe. But what need we more to open your ſtrange miſtake and unjuſt dealing, then the authority of your ſo much approved Council of *Florence*, that received both Greeks and Armenians; and the very words of the Popes Bull of the union, which declare that the Greeks and Latins were found to mean Orthodoxly both? the words are theſe [*Convenientes Latini & Græci in hac ſacroſancta Oecumenica ſynodo magno ſtudio invicem uſi ſunt, ut inter alia articulus etiam ille de Divina Spiritus Sancti proceſſione ſumma cum diligentia & aſſidua inquiſitione diſcuteretur. Prolatis vero teſtimoniis ex Divinis Scripturis, plurimiſque authoritatibus ſanctorum doctorum orientalium & occidentalium, aliquibus quidem ex Patre & Filio, quibuſdam vero ex Patre per Filium procedere dicentibus Spiritū Sanctum,*

Sanctum, & ad eandem intelligentiam aſpicientibus omnibus ſub diverſis vocabulis: Graci quidem aſſeruerunt quod id quod dicunt Spiritum Sanctum ex Patre procedere, non hac mente proferrent ut excludant Filiũ, ſed quia eis videbatur, ut aiunt, Latinos aſſerere ſpiritum Sanctum ex Patre Filioque procedere tanquam ex duobus principiis & duabus Spirationibus, ideo abſtinuerunt à dicendo quod Spiritus Sanctus ex Patre procedat & Filio. Latini vero affirmaverunt non ſe hac mente dicere Spiritum Sanctum ex Filioque *procedere ut excludant Patrem, quin ſit fons ac principium totius Deitatis, Filii ſcilicet, & Spiritus Sancti, aut quod id quod Spiritus Sanctus procedat ex Filio, Filius à Patre non habeat, ſive quod duo ponant eſſe principia, ſeu duas ſpirationes, ſed ut unum tantum aſſerunt eſſe principium, unicamque ſpirationem Spiritus Sancti, prout hactenus aſſeruerunt; & cum ex his omnibus unus & idem eliciatur veritatis ſenſus, tandem,* &c.—]

I pray you now tell it to no more, that it is *ſome Novel writers of ours, preſt by force of argument*, that have been the authors of this extenuation. My heart even trembleth to think that there ſhould be a thing called Religion among you, that can ſo far extinguiſh both Charity and Humanity, as to cauſe

cauſe you to paſs ſo direful a doom (without authority or tryal) on ſo great a part of the Chriſtian world, for ſuch a word as this, about ſo exceeding high a myſterie, when your Pope and Council have pronounced a union of meanings!

And what mean you in your Margin to refer me to *Nilus*, as if he aſſerted [*That the Greeks left the Communion of the* Roman *Church upon that difference alone.*] Verily Sir, in the high matters of God, this dealing is ſcarce fair! (pardon this plainneſs: conſider of it your ſelf.) The ſubſtance of *Nilus* book is about the Primacy of the Pope: The very contents prefixed to the firſt book are theſe [*Oratio demonſtrans non aliam*, &c. *An Oration demonſtrating that there is no other cauſe of the diſſenſion between the Latin and Greek Churches, then that the Pope refuſeth to defer the cogniſance and judgement of that which is controverted to a general Council: but he will ſit the ſole Maſter and Judge of the Controverſie; and will have the reſt as Diſciples to be hearers of (or obey) his word, which is a thing alieno from the Laws and actions of the Apoſtles and Fathers.*]

And he begins his Book (after a few words) thus, [*Cauſa itaque hujus diſſidii*, &c. *The*

&c. *The cauſe therefore of this difference, as I judge, is not the ſublimity of the point exceeding mans capacity: For other matters that have divers times troubled the Church, have been of the ſame kind: This therefore is not the cauſe of the diſſention; much leſs is it the ſpeech of the Scripture it ſelf, which as being conciſe, doth pronounce nothing openly of that which is controverted. For to accuſe the Scripture, is as much as to accuſe God himſelf. But God is without all fault. But who the fault is in, any one may eaſily tell, that is well in his wits.*) He next ſhews, *that it is not for want of learned men on both ſides, nor is it becauſe the Greeks do claim the Primacy*, and then concludeth it as before. He maintaineth that *your Pope ſucceedeth* Peter *only as a Biſhop ordained by him, as many other Biſhops that originally were ordained by him in like manner do ſucceed him*; and that his *Primacy is no Governing power, nor given him by* Peter, *but by Princes and Councils for order ſake*: and this he proves at large, and makes this the main difference. *Bellarmines* anſwering his ſo many Arguments might have told you this, if you had never read *Nilus* himſelf. If you ſay that, *This point was the firſt cauſe*, I deny it; but if it were true, yet was it not *the only or chief*

chief cauſe afterward. The *Manner* of bringing in the [*filioque*] by Papal authority without a general Council, was it that greatly offended the Greeks from the beginning.

But you ſay that when I have made the beſt of theſe Greeks, Armenians, Ethiopians, Proteſtants, I cannot deduce them ſucceſſively in all ages till Chriſt as a *different Congregation of Chriſtians from that which holds the Popes ſupremacy*, which was your propoſition. *Reply.* I have oft told you we own no univerſal informing Head but Chriſt. In reſpect to him I have proved to you, that it is not my intereſt or deſign to prove us or them [*a different Congregation from you as you are Chriſtians.*] Nor ſhall you tempt me to be ſo uncharitable, as to damn, or unchriſten all Papiſts as far as you do others, incomparably ſafer and better then your ſelves. But as you are Papal, and ſet up a new informing head, I have proved that you differ from all the antient Churches, but yet that my cauſe requireth me not to make this proof, but to call you to prove your own univerſal ſucceſſion.

You add your Reaſon, *becauſe theſe beforenamed were at firſt involved in your Congregation, and then fell off as dead branches.*

Reply.

Reply. This is but an untruth in a moſt publick matter of fact. All the truth is this. 1. Thoſe Indians, Ethiopians, Perſians, *&c.* without the Empire, never fell from you, as to ſubjection, as never being your ſubjects. Prove that they were, and you have done a greater wonder then *Baronius* in all his *Annals.* 2 The Greeks, and all the reſt within the Empire, without the *Roman* Patriarchate, are fallen from your Communion (if renouncing it be a fall) but not from your ſubjection, having given you but a Primacy, as *Nilus* ſhews, and not a Governing pewer over them. The withering therefore was in the *Roman* branches, if the corruptions of either part may be called a withering. You that are the leſſer part of the Church may eaſily call your ſelves the Tree, and the greater part (two to one) the Branches; but theſe beggings do but proclaim your neceſſities.

In good time you come to give me here at laſt ſome proof of an *ancient Papacy*, as you think. But firſt, you quite forget (or worſe) that it is not a man or two in the whole world in an age, but the *univerſal Church*,

Church, whoſe judgement (and form) we are now enquiring after. You are to prove [*That all the Church in every age was for the Papal univerſal Government*] and ſo that none can be ſaved that is not.

2. But inſtead of this which you ſhould prove, you prove not that thoſe very ſingle perſons named by you, had any opinion of the Papal Soveraignty.

1. Your firſt Teſtimony is from *Liberatus*, c. 16. [John *Biſhop of* Antioch *makes an appeal to Pope* Simplicius.] *Reply.* 1. I ſee you are deceived by going upon truſt: But its pitty ſo to deceive others. There was no ſuch man as *John* Biſhop of *Antioch* in *Simplicius* raign. *John* of *Antioch* was he that made the ſtirs and diviſions for *Neſtorius*, againſt *Cyril*, and called the Schiſmatical Council at *Epheſus*, and dyed, *Anno* 436. having raigned thirteen years, as *Baronius* ſaith, and eighteen as *Nicephorus*: He dyed in *Sixtus* the fifths time. But its ſaid indeed that John *Biſhop of* Alexandria made ſome addreſs to *Simplicius*: of which *Baronius* citeth *Liberatus* words (not *c.* 16. but *c.* 18.) *ad An. D.* 483. *that* John *being expelled by the Emperour* Zeno's *command, went firſt to* Calendion *Biſhop of* Antioch, *and ſo to* Rome *to* Simplicius, (if *Baronius* were

were to be believed, *as his judge*) *Liberatus* ſaith, that he *took from* Calendion *Biſhop of* Antioch *Letters to* Simplicius, *to whom he appealed as* Athanaſius *had done, and perſwaded him to write for him to* Acacius *Biſhop of* Conſtantinople; *which* Simplicius *did: But* Acacius *upon the receipt of* Simplicius *Letters, writ flatly to him, that he knew no* John *Biſhop of* Alexandria, *but had taken* Petrus Mogus *as Biſhop of* Alexandria *into his Communion, and that without* Simplicius, *for the Churches unity, at the Emperours command*] Here you ſee how little regard *Acacius* made of your Pope: and that the appeal was but to procure his Letters to *Acacius*, which did him no good. 2. But do you in good earneſt think that all ſuch addreſſes, or appeals are *ad ſuperiorem judicem*? What more common then to appeal or make ſuch addreſſes to any that have advantage of intereſt, for the relief of the oppreſſed? Young men appeal to the aged in Controverſies: and the leſs learned to the more learned: and the poor to the rich, or to the favorites of ſuch as can relieve them. *Johns* going firſt to *Antioch* was no acknowledgement of ſuperiority. 3. But of this I muſt refer you to a full anſwer of *Blondel* againſt *Perron, de Primatu*

in

in Eccleſ. cap. 25. *ſect.* 76. where you may be ſatisfied of the vanity of your inſtance. Whereas therefore you infer (or you ſay nothing) that becauſe this *John* thus appealed to *Rome*, therefore he appealed *thither as to the Univerſal Ruler of the Church.*] The ſtory derideth your conſequence. Much more that [*therefore the Univerſall Church held the Pope then to be the Univerſall Head or Governour.*] Heres nothing of Government but intreaty, and that but *within the Empire*, and that but upon the ſeeking of one diſtreſſed man that would be apt to go to thoſe of moſt intereſt that might relieve him, and all this rejected by *Acacius* and the Emperour. A fair proof!

2. Your 2. inſtance is, that *Flavianus appeals to the Pope as to his Judge. Epiſt. præambul. Concil. Chalced.*] *Reply.* I have peruſed all the Council of *Chalcedon*, as it is in *Binnius*, purpoſely to find the words you mention of *Flavians* appeal, and I find not any ſuch words. In *Flavianus* own Epiſtle to *Leo* there are no ſuch words, nor any other that I can find, but the word [*appeal*] once in one of the Emperours Epiſtles (as I remember) but without mentioning any Judge. I will not uſe to turn

over Volumes thus in vain for your citations, while I ſee you take them on truſt, and do not tell me in any narrow compaſſe of cap. ſect. or pag. where to find them. But had you found ſuch words, 1. An appeal is oft made from a *partiall* to an *impartiall* Judge, though of equal power. 2. He might appeal to the Biſhop of *Rome* as *one* of his Judges in the Council where he was to be tried, and not as *alone*. And it is evident in the Hiſtory, that it was not the Pope, but the Council that *was his Judge*. 3. The greatneſſe of *Rome*, and Primacy of Order (not of Juriſdiction) made that Biſhop of ſpeciall intereſt in the Empire: and diſtreſſed perſecuted men will appeal to thoſe that may any whit relieve them. But this proves no Governing power, nor ſo much as any Intereſt without the Empire.

It being the cuſtome of the Churches in the Empire, to make the Votes of the Patriarchs neceſſary in their general Councils, no wonder if appellations be made from thoſe Councils that wanted the Patriarchs conſent to other Councils where they conſented; in which as they gave *Conſtantinople* the ſecond place, without any pretence of a Divine Right, and frequent appeals

peals were made to that Seat; ſo alſo they gave *Rome* the firſt Seat. Of this whole matter *Perron* is fully anſwered already by *Blondell de primatu, cap.* 25. *ſect.* 63. to which I refer you, it being as eaſie to read it in Print as Writing. Adding this only, that as *Flavian* (in his neceſſity) ſeeking help from the Biſhop of the prime Seat in the Empire, did acknowledge no more but his Primacy of Order by the Laws of the Empire and the Councils thereof, ſo the Empire was not all the world, nor *Flavian* all the Church, nor any more then one man, and therefore if he had held (as you will never prove he did) the Univerſall Govern-ment of the Pope, if you would thence argue that it was held by all the Church, your conſequence muſt needs be marvelled at, by them that believe that One man is not the Catholick Church, no more then ſeeking of help was an acknowledging an Univerſal Headſhip or Governing power.

And it is undeniably evident, that the Church of *Conſtantinople* and all the Greek Churches did believe that Univerſal Primacy which in the Empire was ſet up, to be of humane right, and new, and changeable, as I prove not only by the expreſſe teſtimony of the Council of *Chalcedon*, but by *the*

ſtating of the Primacy at laſt in Gregories *dayes on* Conſtantinople *it ſelf, whoſe pretence neither was nor could be any other then a humane late inſtitution.* And if the Greek Churches judged ſo of it in *Gregories* daies, and at the Council of *Chalcedon* in *Leo's* daies, we have no reaſon to think that they ever judged otherwiſe; at leaſt not in *Flavians* dayes, that were the ſame as *Leo's*, and the buſineſſe done about 449. This Argument I here ſet againſt all your inſtances at once; and it is unanſwerable.

3. Your next inſtance is of Pope *Leo's* reſtoring *Theodoret*, upon an *appeal to juſt judgement*] *Reply.* 1. Every Biſhop hath a power to diſcern who is fit for his own Communion; and ſo *Leo* and the Biſhops of the Weſt perceiving *Theodoret* to be Orthodox, received him as a Catholick into their Communion; and ſo might the Biſhop of *Conſtantinople* have done. But when this was done, the Council did not hereupon receive him, and reſtore him to his Biſhoprick, no nor would hear him read the paſſages between Pope *Leo* and him, no nor make a Confeſſion of his faith, but cried out againſt him as a Neſtorian, till he had expreſly Anathematized *Neſtorius* and *Eutiches* before the Council, and then they

received

received and reſtored him: ſo that the finall judgement was not by *Leo*, but by the Council: But if in his diſtreſſe he appealed as you ſay, *to a juſt judgement*, from an unjuſt, or ſought to make *Leo* his friend, no wonder; but this is no grant of an Univerſall Soveraignty in *Leo*: and if it had granted it in the Empire, thats nothing to the Churches in other Empires: Or if he had granted it as to all the world, he was but one man of the world, and not the Catholick Church. The Council expreſly take on them the determination after *Leo*, and they ſlight the Legates of the Pope, and pronounce him a creature of the Fathers, and give *Conſtantinople* equall priviledges, though his Legates refuſe to conſent. But of the frivolouſneſſe of this your inſtance, ſee Dr. *Field* of the Church, *lib.* 5. *cap.* 35. *pag.* 537, 538. and more fully *Blondell de primatu, ubi ſup. cap.* 25. *ſect.* 63, 65.

4. Your next inſtance is of *Cyprians deſire that* Stephen *would depoſe* Martian *Biſhop of* Arles.] *Reply* 1. That Epiſtle cannot be proved to be *Cyprians*: for the Reaſons I refer you to *M. de Launy* on that ſubject, and *Rivets Critica Sacra*: only adding that there are eight copies of *Cypri-*

an, ancient M. S. S. in the Engliſh Univerſities, that have none of them this Epiſtle to *Stephen* (of which ſee *Jerem. Stephens* Edition of *Cyprian de unitate Eccleſiæ*) 2. Could you prove this Epiſtle to be *Cyprians*, it makes againſt you more then for you. *Not for you*: for the diſtance of *Cyprian*, the nearneſſe of *Stephen* might make it a matter more concerning him, and fitter for him to tranſact: And it was within his Patriarchate, and therefore no wonder if he were minded of it. And yet *Cyprian* only writes to him to write to the Biſhops of *France* to reſtrain *Martian*: [§. 2. *Quapropter facere te oportet pleniſſimas literas ad coepiſcopos noſtros in Gallia conſtitutos, ne ultra Martianum pervicacem & ſuperbum, & divinæ pietatis ac fraternæ ſalutis inimicum, collegio noſtro inſultare patiantur.*] *Cyprian* did as much to *Stephen*, as he deſired *Stephen* to do to the Biſhops of *France*: This therefore is againſt you, if any thing to the purpoſe: Had you found but ſuch words of a Pope to another Biſhop as *Cyprian* uſeth to your Pope, you would have taken it as an evidence of his ſuperiority. §. 3. *Dirigantur in provinciam & plebem in Arelate conſiſtentem à te literæ*, &c. [*Let thy Letters be directed to the Province and people at*

at Arles, *&c.*] And its plainly an act of non-Communion common to all Biſhops towards thoſe unfit for their Communion, that *Cyprian* ſpeaks of [§. 3. *Idcirco enim, frater chariſsime, copioſum corpus eſt ſacerdotum concordiæ mutuæ glutino atque unitatis vinculo copulatum, ut ſiquis ex collegio noſtro hæreſim facere, & gregem Chriſti lacerare & vaſtare tentaverit, ſubveniant cæteri, & quaſi paſtores utiles & miſericordes oves dominicas in gregem colligant.*] You ſee it is a common duty of brotherhood, and not an act of juriſdiction that *Cyprian* ſpeaks of.

5. Your next inſtance is, that [*the Council of* Sardis *determined that no Biſhop depoſed by other neighbouring Biſhops, pretending to be heard again, was to have any ſucceſſor appointed till the caſe were defined by the Pope*: *Conc. Sard. cap.* 4. *cited by Athanaſ. Apol.* 2. *pag.* 753.] *Reply.* It ſeems you are well acquainted with the Council, that know not of what place it was! It was the Council at *Sardica*, and not at *Sardis*, that you would mean. *Sardis* was a City of *Lydia, apud Tmolum montem, olim Regio Craſi, inter Thiatiram & Philadelphiam.* But this *Sardica* was a City of *Thrace* in the confines of the higher *Myſia, inter Naiſſum*

iſſum Myſsiæ & Philippopolim Thraciæ. As to the inſtance, 1. This Council was by *Auguſtine* rejected as hereticall, though I defend not his opinion. 2. It was of ſo little note and authority, that it was not known to the Council of Carthage to have the next antecedent Canons (which you would not have omitted if you had read them, its like) in which your writers glory as their chiefeſt ſtrength; and which *Bellarmine* thinks Pope *Zoſimus* call'd, the *Nicene Canon*: or rather is it not ſuſpicious that this Canon is but forged, when thoſe Carthage Fathers plainly ſay, *In nullo Patrum concilio decretum invenimus*; mentioning that antecedent Canon propoſed by *Hoſius*, to which this mentioned by you propoſed by *Gaudentius* is but an addition or ſupplement. And it is not like that all theſe Africane Fathers could be ignorant of thoſe Canons of *Sardica*, when ſuch abundance of Africane Biſhops were at the Council, and that but about 50 years before: you may ſee in *Binnius* how hard a ſtrait he is put to, to give any tolerable reaſon of this, and only ſaith, that its like ſome how the Canons were loſt: ſure Tradition was then grown untruſty. Your Cardinal *Cuſanus de Concord. Cath. l.2.c.25.* makes a doubt whether the

the Canon of appeals be indeed a Canon of this Council. 3. But grant it be, yet take theſe obſervations, and you ſhall find ſmall cauſe of confidence in that Canon.

1. It was made in a Caſe of the diſtreſſe of *Athanaſius* and other Orthodox Orientall Biſhops, meerly in that ſtrait, to ſave them and the Churrhes from the *Arrians*. The *Arrians* withdrew from the Council being the *minor* part, and excommunicated *Julius* with *Athanaſius*, and other Occidentals; and the Occidental Biſhops excommunicated the Oriental. *Athanaſius* himſelf was a chief man in the Council, and had before been reſcued by the help of *Julius*, and therefore no wonder if they deſired this ſafety to their Churches. 2. Note, that this is a thing newly granted now by this Canon, and not any ancient thing. 3. Note, that therefore it was of Humane Right, and not of Divine. 4. Note, that yet this Canon was not received or practiſed in the Church, but after this the contrary maintained by Councils, and practiſed, as I ſhall anon prove. 5. That it is not any antecedent Governing Power that the Canon acknowledgeth in the Pope; but in honour of the Memory of S. *Peter*, as they ſay, (yet more for their preſent ſecurity)

rity) they give this much to *Rome*; it being the vulgar opinion that *Peter* had been there Biſhop. 6. That it is not a Power of judging alone that they give, but of cauſing the re-examination of Cauſes by the Council, and adding his aſſiſtants in the judgement, and ſo to have the putting of another into the place forborn till it be done. 7. And I hope ſtill you will remember, that at this Council were no Biſhops without the Empire, and that the Roman world was narrower then the Chriſtian world: and therefore, if theſe Biſhops in a part of the Empire had now given (not a Ruling, but) a ſaving Power to the Pope, ſo far as is there expreſſed, this had been far from proving that he had a Ruling Power, as the Vice-Chriſt over all the world, and that by Divine right: Blame me not to call on you to prove this conſequence. 8. There is as much for Appeals to *Conſtantinople*, that never claimed a Vice-Chriſtſhip as *Jure divino*.

6. Your ſixth inſtance out of *Baſils* 74. Epiſtle I imagine you would have ſuppreſſed, if ever you had read that Epiſtle, and had thought that any others would be induced by your words to read it. I have given you out of this and other Epiſtles of *Baſil*,

Baſil, a ſufficient proof of his enmity to Popery, in my *Key*, cap. 26. pag. 170, 171, 172. and cap. 27. pag. 177. that very Epiſtle of *Baſils* was written to the *Weſtern Biſhops*, and not to the Biſhop of *Rome* only, nor ſo much as naming him: The help that he deſireth is either a Viſit, or perſwaſive Letters, never mentioning the leaſt Power that the Pope had more then other Biſhops, but only the intereſt of Credit that the Weſtern Biſhops had more then *Baſil* and his Companions: ſaith he [*For what we ſay is ſuſpected by many, as if for certain private contentions, we would ſtrike a fear and puſillanimity into their minds: But for you, the further you dwell from them, ſo much the more credit you have with the common people*: to which this is added, *that the grace of God is a help to you to care for the oppreſſed. And if many of you unanimouſly decree the ſame things, it is manifeſt that the Multitude of you decreeing the ſame things, will cauſe an undoubted reception of your opinion with all.*] You ſee here upon what terms *Liberius* his Letters might beſtead *Euſtathius*: He having received him into his own Communion, and *Euſtathius* being Orthodox in words, no wonder that the Synod of *Tiana* receive him

him upon an Orthodox confeſſion, and their fellow-Biſhops reception and Letters: No doubt but the Letters of many another Biſhop might have perſwaded them to his reception; though he had more advantages from *Rome*. Is it not now a fair Argument that you offer? *Liberius* (ſometime an Arrian Pope of *Rome*) by his Letters prevailed with a Synod at *Tyana* to reſtore *Euſtathius* (an Arrian) that diſſembled an Orthodox confeſſion: What then? *Ergo* the Pope of *Rome* is the Vice-Chriſt, or was then the Governour of all the Chriſtian world. Soft and fair. 1. *Baſil* gives you other reaſons of his intereſt. 2. He never mentioneth his univerſall Government, when he had the greateſt need to be helped by it, if he had known of ſuch a thing. 3. The Empire is not all the world: If *Baſil* knew the Roman Soveraignty, I am certain he was a wilfull Rebel againſt it.

7. Your ſeventh proof is from *Chryſoſtome*, who, you ſay [*expreſly deſireth Pope* Innocent *not to puniſh his adverſaries if they do repent: Chryſ. Epiſt. 2. ad Innoc.*] *Reply.* You much wrong your ſoul in taking your Religion thus on truſt; ſome Book hath told you this untruth, and you believe it, and its like will perſwade others of it

as

as you would do me. There is no ſuch word in the Epiſt. of *Chryſoſtome* to *Innocent*, nor any thing like it.

8. Your eighth proof is this [*The like is written to the Pope by the Council of Epheſus in the Caſe of John of Antioch: Concil. Epheſ. p. 2. Act. 5.*] *Reply.* 1. The firſt Council at *Epheſus* (which no doubt you mean) is in *Binnius* enough to make a conſiderable Volume, and divided into ſix Tomes, and each of thoſe into Chapters, and not into Acts: And if you expect that I ſhould exactly read ſix Tomes *in Folio* before I can anſwer your ſeverall ſentences or ſhreds, you will put me on a twelve-moneths work to anſwer a few ſheets of Paper. If you mean by [p. 2.] [Tom. 2.] and by [Act. 5.] [Cap. 5.] then I muſt tell you there is not a word of that you ſay, nor like it. Only there is reference to *Celeſtines* and *Cyrils* Epiſtles; and *Celeſtine* in his Epiſtle recited Tom. 1. cap. 17. threatens *Neſtorius*, that if he repent not, he will excommunicate him, and they will have no more communion with him, which others did as well as he; but not a word of *John* Biſhop of *Antioch* there. Nor can I find any ſuch thing in the 4. Tome, where *John's* cauſe is handled. Indeed the Notes of your Hiſtorian

Hiſtorian divide the Council into Seſſions: But in his fifth Seſſion there is nothing of *John*, but of *Neſtorius*. And in the 4. Seſſ. *John* and his Party excommunicate *Cyril*, *Memnon*, and theirs. And it was the Council that ſuſpended firſt, and after excommunicated *John*. And it is the Emperour to whom he appeals. Indeed your Annotator in Seſſ. 6. mentions ſome words of *Juvenals*; that he ſhould at leaſt have regarded the Roman Legates, it being the cuſtome that his Church be directed by that: But I ſee no proof he brings of thoſe words; and it is known, that *Cyril* of *Alexandria* did preſide, and ſubſcribed before the Roman Legates, even to the ſeverall Letters of the Synod, as you may ſee in Tom. 2. cap. 23. *& paſſim.*

2. But if your words were there to be found, what are they to your purpoſe? The Pope can puniſh the Biſhop of *Antioch*: But how? Why by excommunicating him. True, if he deſerve it: that is, by pronouncing him unfit for Chriſtian Communion, and requiring his flock, and exhorting all others to avoid him. And thus may another Biſhop do: and thus did *John* by *Cyril* of *Alexandria*, though he was himſelf of the inferiour Seat: and thus

thus hath the Biſhop of *Conſtantinople* done by the Biſhop of *Rome*, and ſo may others.

9. Your ninth proof is from the applications that the Arrians and *Athanaſius* made to *Julius*: *Ex Athan. ad ſolit. Epiſt. Julius in Lit. ad Arian. apud Athan. Apol.* 1. *p.* 753. *Theodoret. lib.* 2. *c.* 4. *Athan. Apol.* 2. *Zozom. l.* 3. *c.* 7.] *Reply.* I marvel you urge ſuch rancid inſtances, to which you have been ſo fully and ſo often anſwered: I refer you to *Blondell de Primatu* cap. 25. ſect. 14, 15. Whittaker *de Roman. Pontif.* p. 150. *& paſſim.* Dr. *Field* of the Ch. l. 5. c. 35, *&c.* Briefly, this may ſhew the vanity of your proof. 1. *Sozomen* in that place ſaith, that though he alone wrote for them, yet he wrote in the Name and by the conſent of all the Biſhops of the Weſt. 2. The advantages of *Rome* by its reputation and greatneſs, and the number and quality of the Weſtern Biſhops, made their Judgement and Communion valuable to others: *Baſil* before cited tells you on what grounds when Churches diſagree, thoſe that are diſtant are ſuppoſed to be impartiall, eſpecially when numerous. To which is added, which *Baſil* intimates, that ſome hope of help from the Secular powers,

powers, by the interpoſition of the Weſtern Biſhops, made them the more ſought to. 3. And the Primacy of *Rome* (though it had no Soveraignty) made it ſeem irregular, that a Patriarch ſhould be depoſed without the knowledge and judgment of the Patriarchs of the precedent Seats. This was the cuſtome that *Julius* ſpoke of, and the Patriarchs of *Conſtantinople* and *Alexandria* might have ſaid as much, if the Patriarch of *Jeruſalem* or *Antioch* had been depoſed without them. 4. Every Patriarch might abſolve the Innocent, and hold communion with them in his own Patriarchate; and if any be againſt it, (as the Arrians here were, and ſent falſe accuſations againſt *Athanaſius* to *Julius*) he may require them to prove their accuſations, if they will have him moved by them. Our own Communion with men, is to be directed by the judgment of our own well informed conſciences. *Julius* deſired not any more then to be one with a Council that ſhould decide the caſe. Councils then had the Rule, and Patriarchs were the moſt honourable Members of thoſe Councils, but no Rulers of them. 5. Yet *Sozomen* and others tell you, that *Julius*, when he had done his beſt to befriend *Athanaſius* and

Paulus

Paulus could do no good, nor prevail with the Biſhops of the Eaſt, till the Emperors commands prevailed: yea the Eaſtern Biſhops tell him that he ſhould not meddle with their proceedings no more then they did with his, when he dealt with the Novatians; ſeeing the greatneſs of Cities maketh not the power of one Biſhop greater then another: and ſo they took it ill that he interpoſed, though but to call the matter to a Synod, when a Patriarch was depoſed. Any Biſhop might have attempted to relieve the oppreſſed as far as *Julius* did: eſpecially if he had ſuch advantages as aforeſaid to encourage him. All your conſequences here therefore are denied. 1. It is denied, that becauſe *Julius* made this attempt, that therefore he was Univerſal Ruler in the Empire. 2. It is denied that it will thence follow, if he were ſo, that it had been by Divine Right, any more then *Conſtantinople* had equall priviledges by Divine Right. 3. It is denied that it hence followeth, that either by Divine or humane right, he had any Power to govern the reſt of the world without the Empire. Had you all that you would rack theſe teſtimonies to ſpeak, it is but that he was made by Councils and Emperours the chief Bi-

ſhop or Patriarch in a Nationall Church (I mean, a Church in one Princes Dominion) as the Archbiſhop of *Canterbury* was in *England*. But a Nationall or Imperiall Church is not the Univerſall. And withall, oppreſſed men will ſeek relief from any that may help them.

In your Margin you adde that [*Concerning S.* Athanaſius *being judged, and rightly, by P.* Julius, Chamier *acknowledgeth the matter of fact to be ſo: but againſt all antiquity pretends that judgment to have been unjuſt.*] *Reply.* Take it not ill Sir I beſeech you, if I awake your conſcience, to tell me, how you dare write ſo many untruths, which you knew, or might know, I could quickly manifeſt. Both parts of your ſaying of *Chamier* p.497, are untrue. 1. The matter of fact is it that he denieth: He proveth to you from *Sozomens* words, that *Athanaſius* did make no appeal to a Judge, but only fled for help to a friend: He ſhews you that *Julius* did not play the Judge, but the helper of the ſpoiled, and that it was not an act of Judgement. 2. He therefore accuſeth him not of wrong judgeing, but only mentioneth his not hearing the accuſed, to ſhew that he did not play the part of a Judge, but a friend; as *Chryſoſtome*

Joſtome did by ſome that fled to him. I pray anſwer his reaſons.

And for what you ſay again in your Margin of *Theodoret*; I ſay again, that he appealeth to the Biſhop of *Rome* for help; as a perſon who with the Weſtern Biſhops might ſway much againſt his adverſaries, but not as to an Univerſal Governour or Judge: no not as to the Univerſal Judge of the Church Imperiall; much leſs of all the Catholick Churches.

10. Your tenth proof is from *Chryſoſtomes* Caſe, where you ſay ſome things untrue, and ſome impertinent. 1. That *Chryſoſtome* appeals to *Innocent* from the Council of *Conſtantinople* is untrue, if you mean it of an Appeal to a ſuperiour Court or Judge; much more if as to an Univerſal Judge: But indeed in his baniſhment, when all other help failed, he wrote to him to interpoſe and help him as far as he could. I need no other proof of the Negative then, 1. That there is no proof of the Affirmative, that ever he made any ſuch appeal. 2. In his firſt Epiſtle to *Innocent*, he tells him over and over, that [*he appealed to a Synod, and required Judgement*] and that he was caſt into a ſhip for baniſhment [*becauſe he appealed to a Synod and a righteous judgement*]

never mentioning a word of any ſuch appeal to the Pope. Yea he urgeth the Pope to befriend and help him, by that argument, that he was ſtill ready to ſtand to uncorrupted Judges, never mentioning the Pope as Judge. By all which it appears it was but the aſſiſtance of his interceſſion that he requireth: and withall, perhaps the excommunicating of the wicked, which another Biſhop might have done. Yea, and it ſeems it was not to *Innocent* only, but to others with him that he wrote; for he would ſcarce elſe have uſed the terms [κυρίοις μου τιμιωτάτοις καὶ ἁγιωτάτοις] But what need we more then his own words to know his requeſt: ſaith he [*Let thoſe that are found to have done ſo wickedly, be ſubject to the penalty of the Eccleſiaſticall Laws: but for us that are not convicted, nor found guilty, grant us to enjoy your Letters, and your charity, and all others whoſe ſociety we did formerly enjoy.*] The Eccleſiaſtical Laws enabled each Patriarch and Biſhop to ſentence in his own Dioceſs; though the perſon ſentenced lived out of their Dioceſs, yet they might renounce all communion with him: Churches that have no power over one another, may have communion with one another; and that communion they

they may hold and renounce as there is cauſe. Now if a neighbour Patriarch with ſo many Biſhops of the Weſt had renounc'd Communion with *Chryſoſtomes* enemies, and alſo written their Letters on his behalf, and taken him ſtill as in their Communion, this he hoped would much further his reſtauration: which yet he doubted, as he had cauſe. For in his ſecond Epiſtle he thanks him for doing his part, though it did no good, or did not avail.

And it is to be noted, that your Author *Nicephorus* tells you, *lib.* 13. *cap.* 31. that *Chryſoſtomes* Letters, and his fellow-Biſhops alſo, and the Clergies of *Conſtantinople*, were all written both to the Emperour *Honorius* and to *Innocent*: And therefore you may ſee by that on what account it was, and what help they did expect. The Emperour was not to excommunicate, but his Letters might do much.

Well, but you alledge *Niceph. l.*13.*c.*34. to prove 1. *Chryſoſtomes* appeal: But you have better or worſe eyes then I, for I can find there no ſuch thing, but a ſeeking for help as aforeſaid. 2. You ſay [Innocentius *nulls his condemnation, and declares him innocent.*] *Anſ.* So might another Biſhop have declared him: But how far it ſhould

be regarded, was not in his power. 3. You ſay he *excommunicates Atticus and Theophilus*, and 4. *Arcadius* the Emperour alſo, and *Eudoxia*.] *Reply.* 1. If he did ſo and did well, another Biſhop might as well have done it. *Mennas* excommunicated *Vigilius* of *Rome*. Excon municating is not alwayes an act of Juriſdiction, but a renouncing of Communion, with a Miniſteriall binding, which any Paſtor on a juſt occaſion may exerciſe, even on theſe that are not of his Dioceſs; examples in Churchhiſtory are common. 2. But I would have you anſwer Dr. *Whittakers* Reaſons, by which he proves that *Nicephorus* is a fabler in this relation, and that that Epiſtle is not *Innocents* which *cap.* 34. he reciteth, *Lib. de pontif. Rom. Contr.* 4. *Qu.* 4. *pag.* 454, 455. 1. Neither *Socrates*, *Theodoret* or *Sozomen* make any mention of this excommunication, who yet write much of the Caſe of *Chryſoſtome* and *Arcadius*: And would theſe men that lived ſo near that time have all ſilenced ſo great and rare a thing, as the excommunication of the Emperour and Empreſs, which would have made ſo great a noiſe and ſtir, that yet mention *Ambroſe* his cenſure of *Theodoſius*? 2. This Bull of *Innocents*, (as *Nicephorus* would have

have us believe it) hath ſuch falſhoods, contrary to more credible hiſtory, as bewray the forgery. For *Socrates lib.* 6. *c.* 19. writeth, that *Eudoxia* died the ſame year that *Chryſoſtome* was baniſhed, and that *Chryſoſtome* died the third year of his baniſhment: And *Sozomen* ſaith *l.* 8. *c.* 28. that *Chryſoſtome* was in baniſhment three years after the death of *Eudoxia*: But, if *Nicephorus* were to be believed, *Eudoxia* was alive and excommunicated by *Innocent* after *Chryſoſtomes* death. Nor can it be ſaid that *Innocent* knew not of her death; for his Legats were ſent to *Conſtantinople* in *Atticus* time, who ſucceeded *Arſacius*, who outlived *Eudoxia*.] This is the ſumme of Dr. *Whittakers* confutation of *Nicephorus*. And withall, who knows not how full of fictions *Nicephorus* is?

In your Margin you pretend to confute *Chamier* p. 498. as ſaying [*That other Biſhops reſtored thoſe wrongfully depoſed as well as the Pope*,] to which you ſay that [*never ſingle Biſhop reſtored any who were out of their reſpective Dioceſs*, &c. *whereas the Biſhop of* Rome *by his ſole and ſingle authority, reſtored Biſhops wrongfully depoſed all the Church over.*] *Reply.* 1. It ſeems you took *Chamiers* words on truſt: peruſe

that page, and ſee his words. 2. Single Biſhops have cenſured, and therefore might as well remit their own cenſures. *Ambroſe* cenſured *Theodoſius*, who was no fixed Member of his charge, and he remitted the Cenſure. *Epiphanius* preſumed even at *Conſtantinople* to excommunicate *Dioſcorus* and his Brethren, *Socrat. lib.* 6. *c.* 14. And many inſtances may be brought both of excommunicating, and again receiving to communion by particular Biſhops, even as to thoſe that were not of their charge. And if the fact were not proved, yet the forbearance proveth not the want of power. 3. I deny your unproved aſſertion, that the Biſhop of *Rome* ſingly reſtored all the Church over: It is a meer fiction. How many reſtored he out of the Empire? Or in the Empire out of his Patriarchate, but ſuaſorily or Synodically.

Your next inſtance of *Theodoſius* his not permitting the Council at *Epheſus* to be aſſembled, and his reconciling himſelf to the Church, is meerly impertinent: We know that he and other Princes uſually wrote to *Rome*, *Conſtantinople*, *Alexandria*, &c. or ſpoke or ſent to more then one of the Patriarchs before they called a Council. You cannot but know that Councils have been

been called without the Pope: and that neither this, nor an Emperours forſaking his errour, is a ſign of the Popes Univerſal Government. That Emperour gave ſufficient teſtimony, and ſo did the Biſhops that adhered to *Dioſcorus*, that in thoſe dayes the Pope was taken for fallible and controlable, when they excommunicated him: But when you cite out of any Author the words that you build on, I ſhall take more particular notice of them. Till then this is enough, with this addition, that the Emperours ſubjection, if he had been ſubject (not to an *Ambroſe*, or other Biſhop, but) only to *Rome*, would have been no proof that any without the Empire were his ſubjects: No more then the King of *Englands* ſubjection to the Archbiſhop of *Canterbury*, would have proved that the King of *France* was ſubject to him.

12. Your twelfth proof from the Council of *Chalcedon*, is from a witneſs alone ſufficient to overthrow your cauſe, as I have proved to you. This Synod expreſly determineth, that your Primacy is a novel humane invention; that it was given you by the Fathers, becauſe *Rome* was the Imperial Seat. If you believe this Synod, the Controverſie is at an end: If you do not, why

do

do you cite it? and why pretend you to believe Generall Councils?

But what have you from this Council againſt this Council? Why, 1. You ſay Martian *wrote to* Leo, *that by the Popes Authority a generall Council might be gathered, in what City of the Eaſtern Church he ſhould pleaſe to chooſe.*] *Reply.* 1. Whereas for this you cite *Act. Concil. Chalcedon.* 1. You tell me not in what Author, whether *Crabbe*, *Binnius*, *Surius*, *Nicolinus*, or where I muſt ſeek it. I have peruſed the *Act.* 1. in *Binnius*, which is 63 pages in *Folio* (ſuch tasks your citations ſet me) and find no ſuch thing; and therefore take it to be your miſtake. But in the *preambul. Epiſt.* I find that *Valentinian* and *Martian* deſire *Leo*'s prayers, and contrary to your words, that they ſay [*Hoc ipſum nobis propriis literis tua ſanctitas manifeſtet, quatenus in omnem Orientem & in ipſam Thraciam & Illyricum ſacræ noſtræ literæ dirigantur, ut ad quendam definitum locum qui nobis placuerit, omnes ſanctiſſimi Epiſcopi debeant convenire.*] It is not [*qui vobis placuerit*] but [*qui nobis.*] But what if you had ſpoke truth, doth it follow that *Leo* was Chriſts Vicar-general Governour of the world, becauſe that the Soveraign of one Commonwealth

monwealth did give him leave to chooſe the place of a Council? Serious things ſhould not be thus jeſted with.

2. You ſay Anatolius *and the reſt of the Eaſtern Biſhops ſent to Pope* Leo *the profeſſions of their faith by his order.*] *Reply.* 1. And what then? therefore Pope *Leo* was both Governour of them and all the Chriſtian world. You ſhould not provoke men to laughter about ſerious things, I tell you. Can you prove this Conſequence? Confeſſions were ordinarily ſent in order to Communion, or to ſatisfie the offended, without reſpect to ſuperiority. 2. But I ſee not the proof of your impertinent words. *Pulcherius* Epiſtle to *Leo*, expreſſeth that *Leo* had ſent his Confeſſion firſt to *Anatolius*, to which *Anatolius* conſented. By your Rule then *Leo* was ſubject to *Anatolius*.

3. You ſay the *Popes Legates ſate firſt in Council.*] *Reply.* What then? therefore the Pope was Governour of the Chriſtian world, though not a man out of the Empire were of the Council. Are you ſtill in jeſt? But if it muſt be ſo, then I can prove that others were the Univerſal Governours, becauſe at *Nice*, and other Councils they ſate before the Legates of the Pope, and in many his Legats had no place. Is this argument

gument good think you? O unfaithful partiality in the matters of ſalvation!

4. You ſay, they *prohibited* Dioſcorus *to ſit by his order*] *Reply.* 1. What then? therefore he was Univerſal Governour of the Church. All alike. Any accuſer in a Parliament or Synod may require that the Accuſed may not ſit as judge, till he be tried. 2. But did you not know that *Leo's* Legates were not obeyed; but that the *Glorioſiſſimi judices & ampliſsimus ſenatus*, required that the cauſe ſhould be firſt made known: and that it was not done till *Euſebius Epiſcop. Dorylæi* had read his bill of complaint? *Binnius Act* 1. *pag.* 5.

5. You ſay the Popes Legates pronounced the Church of *Rome* to be *Caput omnium Eccleſiarum*] *Reply.* 1. What then? therefore he was Governour of all the Chriſtian world? I deny the conſequence. You do nothing but beg: not a word of proof. *Caput* was but *membrum principale*, the Patriarch *primæ ſedes*, and that but in the Empire. 2. The Popes Legates were not the Council, nor judges in their own cauſe, and not oppoſing, ſignifies not alwayes a conſent. 3. But the Council do as I ſaid, expreſly define the point, both what your Primacy is, and of how long ſtanding, and of whoſe

whoſe inſtitution, and that *Conſtantinople* on the ſame grounds had equall priviledges.

6. You ſay, all *the Fathers acknowledged themſelves* Leo's *Children, and wrote to him as their Father.*] *Reply.* Of this you give me not any proof, but leave me to read 190 pages in *Folio*, to ſee whether you ſay true or no. And what if you do, (as I believe you do) can a man of any reading be ignorant how ordinarily other Biſhops were ſtiled *Fathers*, even by their fellow-Biſhops as well as the Biſhop of *Rome*?

7. You add, that *they humbly begged of him that the Patriarch of* Conſtantinople *might have the firſt place next* Rome, *which notwithſtanding the Council had conſented to, as had alſo the third general Council at* Epheſus *before, yet they eſteemed their grants of no ſufficient force, till they were confirmed by the Pope.*] *Reply.* So far were the Council from what you falſly ſay of them, that they put it into their Canons, that *Conſtantinople* ſhould have the ſecond place, yea and equal priviledges with *Rome*, and that they had this on the ſame grounds as *Rome* had its Primacy, even becauſe it was the Imperial Seat: *Vid. Bin. pag.* 133, 124. *col.* 2. And not only *Epheſus*, but the ſecond general Council at *Con-*

Conſtantinople, they tell you had decreed the ſame before. You ſee then (contrary to your fiction) that three general Councils (of the greateſt, likened by *Gregory* to the 4 Evangeliſts) not only judged without the Pope, but by your own confeſſion againſt him (for you ſay, he conſented not) yea ſo much did they ſlight the Popes conſent, that when his Legates diſſented, they were not heard: See *Bin. pag.* 134, 136. They perſiſted in the Council to maintain their Canon 38. notwithſtanding the contradiction of *Lucretius* and *Paſchaſinus*, and by the Judges it was accordingly pronounced, *p* 137. And unanimouſly the whole Synod conſented, never ſtopping at the Roman diſſent. *Pergamius* Biſhop of *Antioch* ſaith [*in omnibus ſanctiſſimum Archiepiſcopum Regiæ civitatis novæ Romæ in honore & cura ſicut Patrem præcipuum habere nos convenit.*] No man contradicted this: And is not this as much or more, then you alledge as ſpoke to *Leo*? They call *Leo* (you ſay) Father: And the Biſhop of *Conſtantinople* is pronounced the *Chief Father in all things, in honour and Cure.* And *Euſebius* Biſhop of *Doryl.* the chief adverſary of *Dioſcorus*, witneſſed that he himſelf, in the preſence of the Clergy of *Conſtantinople*, did read this Canon to the Pope

Pope at *Rome*, and he received it. Upon which your Hiſtorian hath no better an obſervation, then that [*either* Euſebius *lyed, or elſe at that hour he deceived* Leo.] Its true that the Synod writ to him for his conſent: but not as ſuſpending any of their Decrees on it; but telling him over and over, that the things were by them defined and confirmed already, *pag.* 140. that which they deſired of him was, what Synods ordinarily did of Biſhops of their Communion that were abſent [*Hæc, ſicut propria, & amica, & ad decorem convenientiſsima, dignare complecti, ſanctiſsime & beatiſsime pater.*]

13. In your Margin you tell me that *Agapet* in the time of *Juſtinian* depoſed *Anthymius* in *Conſtantinople* againſt the will of the Emperour & the Empreſs.] *Reply.* 1. And doth it follow, that becauſe he did it, therefore he did it juſtly, yea and as the Governour of that Church? when *Menna* Biſhop of *Conſtantinople* excommunicated Pope *Vigilius*, was he not even with him? and did that prove that *Rome* was ſubject to *Conſtantinople*? *Niceph. l.* 17. *c.*26. When *Dioſcorus* excommunicated *Leo*, and an Eaſtern Synod excommunicated *Julius* (*Sozom. l.*3. *c.* 11.) that proves not that they did it juſtly,

ly, or as his Governours. *Honorius* the Emperour depoſed *Boniface* 1. *Otho* with a Synod depoſed *Johan.* 13. *Juſtinian* depoſed *Sylverius* and *Vigilius* : Will you confeſs it therefore juſtly done? 2. As to the hiſtory I refer you to the full anſwer of *Blondel* to *Perron. cap.* 25. *ſect.* 84, 85. 3. Uſurpation and depoſing one another by raſh ſentences was then no rare thing, *Euſebius* of *Nicomedia* threatened the depoſing of *Alexander* of *Conſtantinople*, who ſure was not his ſubject, *Socrat. lib.* 1. *c.*37.(*vel.*25.) *Acacius* of *Cæſarea* and his party depoſe not only *Eleuſius*, *Baſilius* and many others, but with them alſo *Macedonius* Biſhop of *Conſtantinople* : *Socrat.lib.*2. *c.*33. (*vel.*42.) Did this prove *Acacius* the Vice-Chriſt? What ſhould I inſtance in *Theophilus* actions againſt *Chryſoſtome*, or *Cyrils* againſt *Johan. Antiochen.* and many ſuch like? 4. Still you ſuppoſe one Empire to be all the Chriſtian world : We muſt grant you that in all your inſtances !

14. For what you alledge from *Gregory*, I ſhall give you enough of him anon for your ſatisfaction, if you will be indifferent. As to your citation what can I ſay? A years time were little enough to ſearch after your citations, if you ſhould thus write but many

many more ſheets. (If a man had ſo much time and ſo little wit as to attend you) You turn me to *Greg. cap.* 7. *ep.* 63. but what Book, or what Indiction, you tell me not: But whatever it be, falſe it muſt needs be, there being no one Book of his Epiſtles (according to all the Editions that I have ſeen) where *c.* 7. and *ep.* 63. do agree or meet together. But at laſt I found the words in *lib.* 7. *c.* 63. *ep.* 63. To which I ſay, that either your great *Gregory* by [ſubject] meant that the Biſhop of *Conſtantinople* was of an inferiour Order, as the Patriarch of *Alexandria* and *Antioch* were to *Conſtantinople*, that yet had no Government of them; or elſe he could ſay and unſay: But I doubt not but this was all his ſenſe. But if it had been otherwiſe, *Conſtantinople* and the Empire was not all the Chriſtian world.

Your next citation is *lib.* 7. *ep.* 37. But its falſly cited: There is no ſuch word; and you are in ſo much haſte for an anſwer, that I will not read over all *Gregories* Epiſtles.

15. You ſay *Cyril* would not break off Communion with *Neſtorius* till *Celeſtine* had condemned him; of this you give us no proof: But what if it be true? Did you think that it proved the Pope to be the Vice-Chriſt? Prudence might well make *Cyril*

cautelous in excommunicating a Patriarch. And we ſtill grant you, that the Order of the Empire had given the Roman Biſhop the Primacy therein: and therefore no wonder if his conſent were expected. But that *Neſtorius* was condemned by a Council needs no proof: And what if *Celeſtine* began and firſt condemned him? Is he therefore the Univerſal Biſhop? But it was not *Celeſtine* alone, but a Synod of the Weſtern Biſhops. And yet *Cyril* did not hereupon reject him without further warning: And what was it that he threatned, but to hold no Communion with him? *Vid. Concil. Epheſ.* 1. *Tom.* 1. *cap.* 14. And though Pride made excommunication an Engine to advance one Biſhop above others, I can eaſily prove that if I had then lived, it had been my duty to avoid Communion with a notorious Heretick, though he had been Pope.

The long ſtory that you next tell, is but to fill up Paper, that *Cyril* received the Popes Letters, that *Neſtorius* repented not, that he accuſed *Cyril*, that *Theodoſius* wrote to *Celeſtine* about a Council; and many ſuch impertinent words: But the proof is, that *Cyril* was the Popes chief Legate Ordinary! Forſooth becauſe in his abſence he was the chief Patriarch; therefore he is ſaid *Celeſtini*

ſtini locum tenere, which he deſired. Well, let your Pope ſit higheſt, ſeeing he ſo troubles all the world for it. Chriſt will ſhortly bid him come down lower, when he humbleth them that exalt themſelves. That *Cyril* ſubſcribed before *Philip*, you may ſee, *Tom.* 2. *cap.* 23. but where I may find that *Philip* ſubſcribed firſt, you tell me not. But what if the Archbiſhop of *Canterbury* ſate higheſt, and ſubſcribed firſt in *England*? Doth it follow that he was Governour of all the world? no nor of *York* it ſelf neither.

16. And here you tell us of *Juvenal*, *Act.* 6. *Repl.* 1. The Council is not divided into Acts in *Binnius*, but many Tomes and Chapters: but your words are in the *Notes* added by your hiſtorian; but how to prove them *Juvenals* words I know not, nor find in him or you. 2. But why were not the antecedent words of the Biſhop of *Antioch* and his Clergy as valid to the contrary, as *Juvenals* for this? 3. If theſe words were ſpoken, they only import a *Judgeing* in Council as a chief member of it, and not of himſelf. And his *apoſtolica ordinatione* is expreſly contrary to the forecited Canon of the Council of *Chalcedon*, and therefore not to be believed. Yet ſome called things

done *Ordinatione apoſtolica*, which were ordained by the Seats which were held Apoſtolike. 4. But ſtill you reſolve to forget that *Antioch* or the Empire extended not to the Antipodes, nor contained all the Catholick Church.

17. You next tell me of *Valentinians* words A.D.445. *Reply*. It is the moſt plauſible of all your teſtimonies, but worth nothing to your end. For 1. Though *Theodoſius* name *pro forma* were at it, yet it was only *Valentinians* act, and done at *Rome*, where *Leo* prevailed with a raw unexperienced Prince to word the Epiſtle as he deſired; ſo that it is rather *Leo's*, then the Emperours originally: And *Leo* was the firſt that attempted the exceſſive advancement of his Seat above the reſt of the Patriarchs. 2. It is known that the Emperours ſometime gave the Primacy to *Rome*, and ſometime to *Conſtantinople*, as they were pleaſed or diſpleaſed by each of them. So did *Juſtinian*, who A.D. 530. *Lampadio & Oreſte Coſſ. C. de Epiſcopis lib.* 1. *lege* 24. ſaith [*Conſtantinopolitana Eccleſia omnium aliarum eſt Caput*] [*The Church of* Conſtantinople *is the Head of all other.*] 3. It is your fiction, and not the words of *Valentinian* (or *Leo*) that [*the ſucceſſion from* Peter *was the foundation of*

of Romes *Primacy.*] It was then believed that *Antioch* and other Churches had a ſucceſſion from *Peter.* It is the Merit of *Peter*, and the Dignity of the City of *Rome*, and the Authority of the Synod joyntly that he aſcribeth it to. The Merit of *Peter* was nothing but the Motive upon which *Leo* would have men believe the Synod gave the Primacy to *Rome*: And *Hoſius* in the Council of *Sardica* indeed uſeth that as his motive, [Let us for the honour of *Peter*, &c.] They had a conceit that where *Peter* laſt preached, and was martyred and buried, and his relicts lay, there he ſhould be moſt honoured. 4. Here is not the leaſt intimation that this Primacy was by Gods appointment, or the Apoſtles, but the Synods: Nor that it had continued ſo from *Peters* dayes, but that joyntly for *Peters* Merits (and honour) and the Cities dignity, it was given by the Synod. 5. And it was but *Leo's* fraud to perſwade the raw Emperour of the authority of a Synod, which he would not name, becauſe the Synod of *Sardica* was in little or no authority in thoſe daies. The reſt of the reaſons were fraudulent alſo; which though they prevailed with this Emperour, yet they took not in the Eaſt. And *Leo* himſelf it ſeems durſt not pretend to a Divine Right

and Inſtitution, nor to a ſucceſſion of Primacy from the Apoſtles. 6. But nothing is more falſe then your aſſertion, that he extendeth the power [*over the whole viſible Church.*] The word [*Univerſitas*] is all that you tranſlate in your comment, | *the whole viſible Church* | As if you knew not that there was a Roman *Univerſality*, & that Roman Councils were called *Univerſall*, when no Biſhops out of that one Commonwealth were preſent; and that the Church in the Empire is oft called [*the whole Church.*] Yea [*the Roman world*] was not an unuſuall phraſe. And I pray you tell me, what power *Valentinian* had out of the Empire? who yet interpoſeth his authority there, [*Nequid prater authoritatem ſedis iſtius illicitum*, &c.] [*& ut pax ubique ſervetur.*] And in the end, it is *All the Provinces*, that is, the *Univerſity* that he extends his precepts to. 7. And for that annexed | *that without the Emperours Letters, his authority was to be of force through* France; *for what ſhall not be lawfull*, &c. | I *Anſ.* No wonder: for *France* was part of his Patriarchate, and the Laws of the Empire had confirmed his Patriarchal power: and thoſe Laws might ſeem, with the reverence of Synods, without new Letters, to do much:

much: But yet it ſeems, that the riſing power needed this extraordinary ſecular help: *Hilary* it ſeems with his Biſhops thought, that even to his Patriarch he owed no ſuch obedience as *Leo* here by force exacteth. So that your higheſt witneſs (*Leo* by the mouth of *Valentinian*) is for no more then a Primacy, with a ſwelled power in the Roman Univerſality; but they never medled with the reſt of the Chriſtian world: It ſeems by all their writings and attempts, this never came into their thoughts.

And its no credit to your cauſe, that this *Hilary* was (by *Baronius* confeſſion) a man of extraordinary holineſs and knowledge, and is Sainted among you, and hath his Day in your Calendar. And yet *Valentinian* had great provocation to interpoſe (if *Leo* told him no untruths, for his own advantage): For it was no leſs then laying ſiege to Cities, to force Biſhops on them without their conſent, that he is accuſed of; which ſhews to what odious pride and uſurpation, proſperity even then had raiſed the Clergy: fitter to be lamented with floods of tears, then to be defended by any honeſt Chriſtian: *Leo* himſelf may be the principal inſtance.

18. You next return to the Council of *Chalcedon*, *Act.* 1. *& ſeq.* where 1. You refer me

to that *Act.* 1. where is no ſuch matter: but you add [*& ſeq.*] that I may have an hundred and ninety pages in *Folio* to peruſe, and then you call for a ſpeedy anſwer: But the Epiſtle to *Leo* is in the end of *Act.* 16. *pag.* (*Bin.*) 139. 2. And there you do but falſly thruſt in the word [*thou governſt us*] and ſo you have made your ſelf a witneſs, becauſe you could find none: The words are [*Quibus tu quidem ſicut membris caput præeras, in his qui tunm tenebant ordinem benevolentiam præferens: Imperatores vero adornandum decentiſſime præſidebant.*] Now [*to go before*] with you muſt be [*to Govern*]: If ſo, then *Aurelius* at the Council of *Carthage*, and others in Councils that preſided, did govern them. It was but [*benevolentiam præſtuliſſe*] that they acknowledged: And that the Magiſtrates not only preſided indeed, but did the work of Judges and Governours, is expreſs in the Acts; its after wrote in that Epiſtle [*Hæc ſunt, quæ tecum, qui ſpiritu præſens eras, & complacere tanquam fratribus deliberaſti, & qui pene per tuorum vicariorum ſapientiam videbaris, à nobis effecimus*] And [*hæc à tua ſanctitate fuerint inchoata*] and yet [*Qui enim locum veſtræ ſanctitatis obtinent, iis ita conſtitutis vehementer reſiſtere tentaverunt.*] From all which

which it appeareth, that he only is acknowledged to lead the way, and to pleaſe them as his brethren, and to help them by the wiſdome of his ſubſtitutes; and yet that the Council would not yield to their vehement reſiſtance of one particular.

But I have told you oft enough that the Council ſhall be judge, not in a complementall Epiſtle, but in *Can.* 28. where your Primacy is acknowledged; but 1. As a gift of the Fathers. 2. And therefore as new. 3. For the Cities dignity. 4. And it can be of no further extent then the Empire; the Givers and this Council being but the Members of that one Commonwealth: So that all is but a novel Imperial Primacy.

19. And for the words of *Vincentius Lirinenſis*, *c.* 9. what are they to your purpoſe? [*quantum loci authoritate*] ſignifieth no more then we confeſs, *viz.* that in thoſe times the greatneſs of *Rome*, and humane Ordination thereupon, had given them that precedency, by which their [*loci authoritas*] had the advantage of any other Seat: Or elſe they had never ſwelled to their impious Uſurpation.

I have plainly proved to you in the End of my [*Safe Religion*] that *Vincentius* was no Papiſt.

But

But you draw an argument from the word [*ſanxit*]. As if you were ignorant that bigger words then that are applied to them that have no governing power; *Quantum in ſe ſanxit*, he charged them that they ſhould not innovate: And what? is it *P. Stephen* that is the Law-giver of the Law againſt unjuſt innovation? Did not *Cyprian* believe that this was a Law of Chriſt before *Stephen* medled in that buſineſs? What *Stephens* authority was in thoſe dayes, we need no other witneſſes then *Firmilian*, *Cyprian*, and a Council of *Carthage*, who ſlighted the Pope as much as I do.

I pray anſwer *Cyprians* teſtimony and arguments againſt Popery, cited by me in the *Diſſ.* 3. of my [*ſafe Religion.*]

20. You ſay you will conclude with the ſaying of your prieſt *Philip*, and *Arcadius* at *Epheſus*: And 1. You take it for granted that all *conſented to what they contradicted not*: But your word is all the proof of the conſequence. Nothing more common, then in Senates and Synods to ſay nothing to many paſſages in ſpeeches, not conſented to. If no word not conſented to in any mans ſpeech muſt paſs without contradiction, Senates and Synods would be no wiſer Societies then *Billingsgate* affords; nor more

more harmonious then a Fair or vulgar rout: What confuſion would contradictions make among them?

2. You turn me to *Tom.* 2. *pag.* 327. *Act.* 1. I began to hope of ſome expedition here: But you tell me not at all what Author you uſe: And in *Binnius* which I uſe, the Tomes are not divided into Acts, but Chapters, and *p g.* 327. is long before this Council. So that I muſt believe you, or ſearch paper enough for a weeks reading to diſprove you: This once I will believe you, to ſave me that labour, and ſuppoſing all rightly cited, I reply: 1. *Philip* was not the Council. You bear witneſs to your ſelves, therefore your witneſs is not credible. Yet I have given you inſtances in my [*Key*] (which I would tranſcribe if I thought that you could not as well read Print as M. S.) of higher expreſſions then *Caput* and *fundamentum*, given to *Andrew* by *Iſychius*, and equal expreſſions to others, as well as *Rome* and *Peter*. And who is ignorant that knoweth any thing of Church-hiſtory, that others were called ſucceſſours of *Peter* as well as the Biſhop of *Rome*? And that the *Claves regni* were given to him, is no proof that they were not given alſo to all the reſt of the Apoſtles. And

where

where you ſay [Arcadius *condemneth* Neſtorius *for contemning the command of the Apoſtolick Sea.*] (You tell me not where to find it.) I anſwer you ſtill, that its long ſince your Sea begun to ſwell and rage, but if you muſt have us grant you all theſe conſequences, [Celeſtine *commanded, therefore he juſtly commanded, therefore another might not as well have commanded him*: (as one Paſtor may do another, though equall, in the name of Chriſt): *and therefore he had power to command without the Empire, even over all the Catholick Church; and therefore the Council was of this mind: yea, therefore the univerſal Church was of this mind, that the Pope was its univerſal head.*] You ſtill are guilty of ſporting about ſerious things, and moving pity, inſtead of offering the leaſt proof.

Yet fear you not to ſay [*that in the time of the holy Oecumenical Councils of* Epheſus *and* Chalcedon, *the univerſal conſent of the whole Catholick Church was for you in this point.*] The Lord keep our conſciences from being the ſervants of our opinions or intereſts. 1. Was the Popes Legate the whole Catholick Church? 2. Was there one man at either of theſe Councils but within the Empire, yea a piece of the Empire?

Pire? So that they were but ſuch as we now call National Councils, that is, conſiſting only of the ſubjects of one Republick. 3. Did the Council ſpeak a word for your power without the Empire? 4. Do they not determine it ſo expreſly to be of humane right, that *Bellarmine* hath nothing regardable to ſay againſt it (*Can.*28.*Conc.Chalced.*) but that they ſpoke falſly? And yet your opinion or intereſt hath tempted you to appeal. *viz.* to the Sun that there is no ſuch thing as light.

21. After the concluſion you have a ſupernumerary in your Margin, from *Greg. lib.*10.*Epiſt.*30. But there is no ſuch word in that Epiſtle, nor is it of any ſuch ſubject. But its [the 31. *Epiſtle* its like that your leader meant. And there's no more but that a Biſhop not named (perſon or place) having fallen into Schiſm voluntarily, ſwore never more to depart from the Unity of the Catholick Church, or the ſea of *Rome*. But 1. So may a Biſhop of the Roman Province do (or Patriarchate) without believing *Rome* to be the Univerſal Head. So might one in any other Province have done: And yet it follows not that he *ought* to do ſo, becauſe he *did* ſo. You ſee now what all your proofs are come to, and how ſhamefully

fully naked you have left your cauſe.

In ſumm, of all the teſtimonies produced, 1. You have not named one man that was a Papiſt (Pope *Leo* was the neareſt of any man) nor one teſtimony that ever a Pope of *Rome* had the Government of all the Church without the verge of the Roman Empire; but only that he was to the Roman Church, as the Archbiſhop of *Canterbury* to the Engliſh Church: And as between *Canterbury* and *York*, ſo between *Rome* and *Conſtantinople*, there have been contentions for preheminency: But if I can prove *Canterbury* to be before *York*, or *Rome* before *Conſtantinople*, that will prove neither of them to be Ruler at the Antipodes, or of all the Chriſtian world. 2. Much leſs have you proved that ever *any Church* was of this opinion, that the Pope was by Divine Right the Governour of all the world, when you cannot prove one man of that opinion. 3. Much leſs have you proved a ſucceſſion of ſuch a Church from the Apoſtles, having ſaid as much as nothing concerning the firſt 300 years. 4. And yet much leſs have you proved, that the *whole Catholick Church* was of this opinion. 5. And leaſt of all have you proved, that the *whole Church took this Primacy of* Rome, *to be of neceſſity*

to

to the very Being of the Church, and to our ſalvation; and not only *ad melius eſſe*, as a point of *Order*. *So that you have left your Cauſe in ſhameful nakedneſs, as if you had confeſſed*, that you can prove nothing.

In the end you return to terms. To what you ſay about the word [*Chriſtians*] I only ſay, that its but equivocally applied to any that profeſs not all the Eſſentialls of Chriſtianity, of which Popery is none, any more then Pride is.

About the word [*Monarch*] in good ſadneſs, do you deny the Pope to be [*an imperious ſole Commander.*] Which of theſe is it that you deny? not that he is [*a Commander*] not that he is [*imperious*] not that he is [*ſole*] in his Soveraignty! I would either you or we knew what you hold or deny. But perhaps the next words ſhew the difference [*as Temporal Kings.*] But this ſaith not a word *wherein* they differ from [*Temporal Kings*]: ſure your following words ſhew not the difference. 1. *Kings* may [*receive power from Chriſt.*] 2. *Kings* muſt rule [*in meekneſs, charity and humility.*] But I think the meekneſs, charity and humility of Popes, hath been far below even wicked Kings (if cruel murdering Chriſtians for Religion, and ſetting the world on

on fire may be witneſs) as your own Hiſtories aſſure us. 3. The Government of Kings alſo is for [*mens eternal good*] however Papiſts would make them but their executioners in ſuch things. 4. Brethren, as ſuch, are no ſubjects: and therefore if the Pope Rule men but as Brethren, he rules them not by Governing authority at all. 5. Children to him we are not: You muſt mean it but Metaphorically! And what mean you then? Is it that he muſt do it in Love for their good? So alſo muſt Kings: So that yon have yet expreſt no difference at all.

But our Queſtion is not new, nor in unuſuall terms: What Soveraignty you claim, you know or ſhould know. Are you ignorant that *Bellarmine*, *Boverius*, and ordinarily your Writers labour to prove that the Government of the Church is Monarchicall, and that the Pope is the Monarch? the ſupream Head and Ruler, which in Engliſh is the Soveraign. Are you aſhamed of the very Cauſe or Title of it, which you will have neceſſary to our ſalvation?

Next you ſay, that you [*very much diſlike the Title of Vice-Chriſt, as proud and inſolent, and utterly diſclaim from it, neither was it ever given by any ſufficient authority*

to

to your Popes, or did they ever accept of it.]
Reply. Now bleſſed be God that makes ſin a ſhame to it ſelf, that the Patrons of it dare ſcarce own it without ſome paint or vizard.

1. Is not the very life of the Cauſe between you and us, whether the Pope be the Univerſal Head of the Church, *vice Chriſti. & vicarius Chriſti*? Are not theſe the moſt common titles that Papiſts give them, and that they take unto themſelves? Nay look back into your own papers here *pag.* 6. whether you ſay not that they are [*Inſtituted Governours in Chriſts place of his whole Viſible Church.*] 2. Doth not *Bellarmine* (as I have cited elſewhere) labour to prove, that it is not as an Apoſtle that the Pope ſucceeds *Peter*, but as a Head of the Church in Chriſts ſtead? Doth not *Boverius* (cited in my *Key*) labour to prove him the Vicar of Chriſt, and to be *Vice Chriſti*? And what fitter Engliſh have we for the Kings deputy in a diſtant Kingdom, who is *Vice Regis*, then the Vice-King? Or a Chancelors deputy, then [the *Vicechancellor*]: *Vice Chriſti* is your own common word, and *Vicarius Chriſti*; none more common ſcarce then the latter: And what Engliſh is there fitter for this, then the *Vice-Chriſt*, or *Vicar* of Chriſt?

It is indeed the very term that expreſſeth properly as man can ſpeak, the true point and life of the Controverſie between us. And how could you ſuffer your pen to ſet down that the Popes did never accept of this, when it is their own common phraſe [*Vice Chriſti, & Vicarius Chriſti?*] But here again remember (and let it be a witneſs againſt you) that you diſlike and utterly diſclaim the very name that ſignifieth the Papal Power, as *Proud* and *Inſolent*. And if you abhor Popery while you tice men to it, let my ſoul abhor it, and let all that regard their ſouls abhor it. Bleſſed be that Light that hath brought it to be numbred with the works of darkneſs.

Were it not more tedious then neceſſary, I would cite you the words [*Vice Chriſti & Vicarius Chriſti*] out of Popes and multitudes of your Writers. But alas thats not the higheſt: The *Vice-God* is a Title that they have not thought inſolent, or words of the ſame ſignification. Would you have my proof? Pardon it then for proving your pen ſo falſe and deceitfull (thats not my fault.)

Pope *Julius the ſecond* in his General Council at the Laterane, ſaith (*Cont. Pragmat. ſanct. monitor. Binnius Vol.* 4. *pag.* 560.)

[*Though*

[*Though the inſtitutions of ſacred Canons, holy fathers, and Popes of Rome* ——— *and their Decrees be judged immutable, as made by Divine inſpiration; yet the Pope of Rome, who, though of unequal Merits, holdeth the place of the eternall King, and the Maker of all things, and all Laws on earth, may abrogate theſe decrees when they are abuſed.*] Here from your Judge of faith it ſelf, you hear [*that the Pope holds the place of the eternal King, the Maker of all things and Laws.*]

Pope *Sixtus Quartus in paſſagio ſive Bulla contra Turcos*, ſent to *Philip Palatine* Elector 1481. *in Breheri Tom. 2. pag. 162. Vol. 2.* ſaith [*Univerſos Chriſtianos Principes, ac omnes Chriſti fideles requirere, eiſque mandare* Vice Dei, *cujus locum, quamvis immeriti tenemus in terris* ———] that is, we are conſtrained [*to require all Chriſtian Princes, and all believers of Chriſt, and to command them, in the ſtead of God, whoſe place on earth we hold, though undeſerving* ———] Here is a Vice-God, holding his place on earth, and commanding all Princes and Chriſtians to a War againſt the Turks in Gods ſtead

I know to a particular people Gods Embaſſadours are ſaid to ſpeak in his name and ſtead, as if God did beſeech men by us,

2 *Cor.* 5. 19. But this is only as to a narrow and limited Embaſſage, not that they hold Gods place on earth, as Rulers over the Univerſal Church, &c.

The ſame Pope *Sixtus* 4. ſaith *ibid. pag.* 163. [*Sola ſupereſt Romana ſedes: ſedes utique immaculati agni: ſedes Viventis in ſecula ſeculorum: Hæc quippe prædictas Patriarchales genuit Eccleſias; quæ quaſi filiæ in ejus gremio reſidebant, & in circuitu tanquam famulæ in ipſius adſiſtebant obſequio.*] that is, [*Only the Roman ſeat remaineth: even the ſeat of the Immaculate Lambe: the ſeat of him that liveth for ever* (my fleſh trembleth to write theſe things): *This did beget the foreſaid Patriarchal Churches* (notorious falſhood!) *which reſted as daughters in her boſome, and as ſervants ſtood about in her obedience.*] Here you ſee from the Pope himſelf, that the other Patriarchs are his ſervants, and ſo to obey him; and that *Rome* begot them all (that were before it, except *Conſtantinople*) and neither made Chriſtians nor Patriarchs by it, and that *Rome* is now become the ſeat of the Immaculate Lambe, and of him that liveth for ever.] Truly the reading of your own Hiſtorians, and the Popes Bulls, &c. hath more perſwaded me, that the Pope is Antichriſt, then the

Apo-

Apocalyps hath done (becauſe I diſtruſted my underſtanding of it.)

Benedictus de Benedictis wrote a Book againſt Dr. *Whittaker*, to prove that its as falſe that the Pope is Antichriſt, as that Chriſt is Antichriſt, and dedicated it to Pope *Paul.* 5. with this inſcription, *Paul.* 5. *Vice Deo*: To *Paul* 5. the Vice-God.] printed at *Bononia* 1608.

Caraffa's Theſes printed at *Naples* 1609. had the ſame inſcription [*Paulo* 5. *Vice Deo*] *to Paul* 5. *the Vice-God.*

Alcazar *in Apocal. in carmine ad* Johannem *Apoſtolum*, ſaith of the ſame Pope *Paul.* 5. [*Quem numinis inſtar, Vera colit pietas.*] [*whom as a God true piety adores.*]

Chriſtopher Marcellus in his Oration before Pope *Julius* 2. in the approved Council at *Laterane, Seſſ* 4. (and you take not contradicting to be conſenting; and verily to ſuch blaſphemy in a Council, ſo it is) ſaith thus [*Quum tanta reipublica unicus atque ſupremus Princeps fueris inſtitutus, beatiſſime pontifex, cui ſumma data poteſtas, ad divinum injunctum imperium*, &c.] —— *& ante* [*ſub tuo imperio*] *&* [*Unus princeps qui ſummam in terris habeat poteſtatem.*] But theſe are ſmall things [*Teque omnis avi, omnium ſeculorum, omnium gentium Princi-*

pem & Caput appellant.] But yet [*the Prince and Head of all ages and Nations*] is too low [*Cura Pater beatiſſime ut ſponſæ tuæ forma decórque redeat.*] But yet to make the Church [*his ſpouſe*] is nothing [*Cura denique ut ſalutem quam dediſti nobis, & vitam & ſpiritum non amittamus : Tu enim Paſtor, tu medicus, tu gubernator, tu cultor, tu denique alter Deus in terris.*] That is, [*See that we loſe not the health that thou haſt given us, and the life and ſpirit. For thou art the Paſtor, the Phyſician — to conclude, thou art another God on earth.*]

If you ſay that the Pope accepteth not this ; I anſwer it was in an oration ſpoken in a Generall Council, in his preſence, without contradiction, yea by his own command, as the Oratour profeſſeth [*Juſſiſti tu, Pater ſancte, & parui*] [*you commanded me, Holy Father, and I obeyed,*] *Binnius pag.* 562, 563, 564. you may find all this.

In Gloſſ extrav. g. Joan. 22. de Verb. ſignific. cap. Cum inter, in Gloſſa: Credere Dominum noſtrum Deum Papam conditorem dictæ decretalis & iſtius, non potuiſſe ſtatuere prout ſtatuit, hæreticum cenſeatur.] So that by your Law we muſt believe the power of your *Lord God the Pope*, or be hereticks.

If

If you meet with any Impreſſions that leave out [*Deum*] take *Rivets* note [*haberi in editione formata juſſu Greg.* 13. *à correctoribus Pontificiis, nec in cenſuris Gl ſſæ juſſu Pii* 5. *editis, quæ in expurgatorio indice habentur, nomen Dei eraſum fuiſſe.*]

Pope *Nicolas* 3. *de El ct. cap. fundamenta in* 6. ſaith [*that* Peter *was aſſumed into the Society of the individuall Trinity.*]

Angelus Polit. in Orat. ad Alex. 6. *Pontificem ad Divinitatem ipſam ſubl tum, aſſerit:* He ſaith, *the Pope was taken up to the Godhead it ſelf.*

At the foreſaid Council at *Laterane*, *Antonius Puccius* in an Oration before *Leo* the tenth in the Council, and after publiſhed by his favour, ſaid [*Divina tua Majeſtatis conſpectus, rutilante cujus fulgore imbecilles oculi mei caligant.*] *His eyes were darkened with beholding the Popes Divine Majeſty.*] None contradicted this.

In the ſame Council, *Simon B gnius Modruſienſis Epiſcopus*, in an O ation *S ſſ.* 6. calls *Leo* [*The Lion of the Tribe of* Juda, *the root of* Jeſſe, *him whom they had looked for as the Saviour.*]

In the ſame Council, *S ſſ.* 10 *Stephanus Patracenſis Archiep.* ſaith [*Reges in compedibus magnitudinis magni Regis liga, & nobiles*

biles in manicis ferreis cenſurarum conſtringe, quoniam tibi data eſt omnis poteſtas in cœlo & in terra ——] and before [*qui totum dicit, nihil excludit.*] So that all Power in heaven and earth is given to the Pope.

Paulus Æmilius de geſtis Francorum, lib. 7. ſaith, that the *Sicilian Embaſſadours lay proſtrate at the Popes feet, and thrice repeated,* [*Thou that takeſt away the ſins of the world, have mercy on us.*]

And prove to me that ever any ſuch man was reprehended for theſe things by the Popes of late.

Auguſt. Triumphus in Præfat. ſum. ad Joan. 22. ſaith [*That the Popes power is infinite: for great is the Lord, and great is his power, and of his greatneſs there is no end.*

And *qu.* 36. *ad* 6. he ſaith that [*the Pope influenceth (or giveth) the Motion of direction, and the ſenſe of cognition, into all the Members of the Church, for in him we live and move and have our being.*]

And a little after he ſaith, [*The will of God, and conſequently of the Pope, who is his Vicar, is the firſt and higheſt cauſe of all corporal and ſpiritual motions.*]

Would you have any more witneſs of the falſhood of your words: ſaith *Zabarella I.C. lib.*

lib. de ſchiſm. Innocent. 7. *& Bened. pag.* 20. [*For this long time paſt, and even to this day, thoſe that would pleaſe the Popes, perſwaded them that they could do all things: and ſo that they might do what they pleaſed, even things unlawfull, and ſo more than God.*]

Antonius parte 3. *tit.* 21. *cap.* 5. §. 4. ſaith [*The Pope receiveth from the faithfull adorations, proſtrations, and kiſſes of his feet, which* Peter *permitted not from* Cornelius, *nor the Angel from* John *the Evangeliſt.*]

Cardinalis Bertrandus Tract. de origin. juriſd. q. 4. *num.* 4. (*& in Gloſ. extrag. com. l.* 1. *fol.* 12.) ſaith [*Becauſe Jeſus Chriſt the ſon of God while he was in this world, and even from eternity, was a Naturall Lord, and by Naturall right could pronounce the ſentence of depoſition on Emperours, or any others, and the ſentence of damnation, and any other, as upon the Perſons which he had created, and endowed with naturall and free gifts, and alſo did conſerve; it is his will that on his account his Vicar may do the ſame things. For the Lord ſhould not ſeem diſcreet (that I may ſpeak with his reverence) unleſs he had left behind him one Vicar that can do all theſe things.*]

Tell me now whether you ſaid true in the

the Paragraph about the Title Vice-Chriſt? yea, whether it be not much more that hath been *given* and *accepted*?

But what name elſe is it that you agree on as proper to expreſs the power which is controverted? I know no name ſo fitted to the reall controverſie? And therefore in diſclaiming the Name, for ought I know, you diſclaim your Cauſe, and confeſs the ſhame of Popery. If he that ſeeks to be King of *England*, ſhould ſay he diſclaimeth *the Title of King as inſolent and proud*, doth he not allow me to conclude the like of the *thing*, which he concludeth of the proper name? The name [*Papa*] [*Pope*] you know (its like) was uſually by the ancients given to other Biſhops as well as to him of *Rome*; and therefore that cannot diſtinguiſh him from other men: The ſame I may ſay of the Titles [*Dominus*, *Pater ſanctiſſimus*, *beatiſſimus*, *Dei amantiſſimus*, and many ſuch like]—— And for [*ſummus Pontifex*] *Baronius* tells you (*Martyrol. Rom. April.* 9.) that [*it was the ancient cuſtome of the Church to call all Biſhops, not only Pontifices, Popes, but the Higheſt or Chief Popes*] citing *Hierom. Ep.* 99. And for the word *Head of the Church*, or *of all Biſhops*, it hath been given to *Conſtantinople*, that yet claimeth not

not (as *Nilus* tells you) neither a precedency to *Rome*, nor an Univerſall Government, much leſs as the *Vice-Chriſt*. And that the Biſhop of *Conſtantinople* was called [*the Apoſtolick Univerſal Biſhop*] Baronius *teſtifieth from an old Vaticane monument*, which on the other ſide calls *Agapetus* [*Epiſcoporum Princeps.*] The Title [*Apoſtolick*] was uſually given to others. *Hieruſalem* was called [*the mother of the Churches.*] A Council gave *Conſtantinople* the Title of [*Univerſal Patriarch*] which though *Gregory* pronounced *ſo impious and intolerable for any to uſe, yet the* following Popes made an agreement with *Conſtantinople*, that their Patriarch ſhould keep his Title of *Univerſal Patriarch*] and the Biſhop of *Rome* be called [*the Univerſal Pope*;] which can ſignifie nothing proper to him (the name Pope being common) more then [*Univerſal Patriarch*] doth. The *Foundations*, and *Pillars* of the Church, and the Apoſtles ſucceſſors, yea *Peters* ſucceſſors, were Titles given to others as well as him: and more then theſe. It being therefore the point in controverſie between us, whether the Biſhop of *Rome*, be in the place of Chriſt or as his Vicár, the Head, Monarch, or Governour of the Church univerſal; and the terms

terms [*Vice Chriſti & Vicarius Chriſti*] being thoſe that Popes and Papiſts chooſe to ſignifie their claim, what other ſhould I uſe?

As to what you ſay of the *Council of Conſtance* (which you muſt ſay alſo of *Baſil*, and of the French Church, Venetians, &c.) you pretend the doubt to be only between Ordinary and extraordinary Governours. But 1. of old the Councils called Generall (indeed but of one Principality) were more ordinary, then now the Pope hath brought them to be: (and I blame him not, if he will hold his greatneſs, to take heed of them.) 2. The way not to have been extraordinary, if the Council of *Conſtance* had been infallible, or of ſufficient power, who decreed that there ſhould be one every ten years. 3. The Councils that continue ſo many years as that at *Trent* did, are then become an Ordinary Government. 4. What is given to the Church Repreſentative, is by many of you given to the Church reall or *eſſentiall* (as you call it) which is ordinarily exiſtent, only not capable of exerting the power it hath: The *ſingulis major, at univerſis minor*, is no rare doctrine with you. 5. But let it be as extraordinary as you pleaſe, if while theſe Councils ſit, the Pope

Pope loſe his Headſhip, your Church is then two Churches ſpecifically diſtinct, and the form of it changeth when a Council ſitteth: which is a two-headed, mutable Church, not like the Spouſe of Jeſus Chriſt. 6. As your Popes are ſaid to live in their conſtitutions, and Laws, when the perſon dyeth; and your Church is not thought by you to die with them; ſo why may not Councils do? The Laws of Councils live when they ſit not, and the French think that theſe Laws are above the Pope; though I ſhewed you even now that *Julius* 2. *in Conc. Latter.* concluded otherwiſe of Decrees, and the Council of the Popes power. 7. If a Nation be Governed by Trienniall (and ſo Decenniall) Parliaments as the higheſt power, and Councils of State in the intervalls, who ſhall be accountable to Parliaments; will you ſay that theſe Parliaments are extraordinary, and not the ordinary Soveraign? No doubt they are. And the Council of State is not the Soveraign, but the chief Officer or Magiſtrate for execution in the intervals.

Having begun this Reply *May* 2. I was again taken off it about *May* 5. or 6. And about

about *May* 11. I received a Letter from you, wherein you tell me of a quarter of a years expectation. Be patient good Sir! Theſe matters concern Eternity: Believe it, I have ſomewhat elſe to do of greater haſt and moment. Even ſome of your own friends find me more work. What if ten of you write to me at once, is it fair for each one of you to call for an anſwer as haſtily as if I had but one in hand? This is not my caſe, but it is more then thus. Fear not leſt I give you over, till you firſt prove the deſerter, and turn your back (if God enable me:) Only I muſt tell you, that I take it for a flight already, and a forſaking of your Cauſe, that you turn to theſe rambling impertinent citations and diſcourſes, in ſtead of a Syllogiſticall arguing the caſe, and that when you had ſpoken ſo much for it. I have here (that you may have no cauſe of exception, nor pretence of cauſe) in this Paper replyed to your laſt; and in another proved the Viſibility of our Church ſyllogiſtically; and (as overplus) alſo diſproved yours, and proved it to be an upſtart, the ſprout of Pride, upon occaſion of the greatneſs of the City of *Rome*, and of the forming the Church to the Civil State, in that one Empire. If now you will deny to do the like, I

ſhall

ſhall conclude you fly and forſake your Cauſe. Beſides your Rejoinder to this Reply, I principally expect that you ſyllogiſtically (in cloſe and faithfull Arguing) do prove to us the Affirmative of theſe Queſtions following.

Qu. [*Whether the Church, of which the ſubjects of the Pope are Members, hath been viſible ever ſince the dayes of Chriſt on earth.*] *In which theſe three Queſtions are involved, which you have to prove:* 1. *Whether the Papacy, that is, the Univerſal Monarchy, or Soveraign Government, or Vice-Chriſtſhip of the Pope (take which term you like) hath continued from Chriſts dayes till now.* 2 *Whether all the Catholick Church did ſtill ſubmit to it, and were ſubjects of the Pope.* 3. *Whether thoſe that did ſubmit to it, did take it to be neceſſary to the Being of the Church, and the ſalvation of all believers, or only to the more peaceable and better being.*] If you call for Catalogues, or proof of Viſible ſucceſſion, and pretend ſo high to it your ſelves, and yet will give us none when we importune you to it, you tell us that you ſeek not to reveal the truth and Church but to hide them. I urge you the harder (though it may ſeem immodeſt) becauſe as the Cauſe doth lie upon your proof here, ſo I know you

you cannot do it: Pardon my confidence: I know you can do no more then *Baronius, Bellarmine, Bullinger*, &c. ſet together have done: and therefore I ſay, I know you cannot do it. I know your Vice-Chriſt (I doubt the Antichriſt) is of humane introduction, ſpringing out of a Nationall (I mean Imperiall) Primacy, which alſo was of humane invention. It was but one Civil Government or Commonwealth, in which your Biſhop had his Primacy, and that long without a Governing power. And this National Primacy, becauſe of the greatneſs of the Empire, was at laſt called Univerſal: And even this was long after the dayes of Chriſt (ſome hundreds of years) a ſtranger in the Church, unleſs as the Greatneſs of the Church of *Rome*, and advantages of the place, did give that Church ſuch authority as ariſeth from magnitude, ſplendour, honour, and accidental advantages from the populouſneſs, wealth, and glory of the City of *Rome*.

The carnall Church is led by the Vice-Chriſt, the earthly Prince of Pride, contending in the world for command and ſuperiority; and proſecuting his Cauſe with Strappados, fire, ſword, and gunpowder, when Chriſt gave no Paſtor a Coercive power,

power, to touch mens bodies or eſtates. The true ſpirituall Church is Headed and commanded by Jeſus Chriſt the Prince of Peace, and knoweth no other Univerſal Head, becauſe no other hath either Capacity or Authority. It obeyeth his Laws; and learneth of him to be charitable, patient, meek, and lowly; and wonders not at errours and diviſions on earth, nor therefore accuſeth the providence of God: but knoweth by faith, that the Univerſal Judge of Controverſies is at the door, and that it is but a very little while, and we ſhall ſee that the Church had an Univerſal Head, that was alone ſufficient for his work; for he that cometh will come, and will not tarry: Amen, Even ſo come Lord Jeſus!

Sir, I deſire you preſently to ſend me word, whether you will by cloſe Syllogiſticall arguing, prove the ſucceſſive viſibility of your Church as Papal, or not, that I may know what to expect?

And once more I pray you take the help of the ableſt of your party, both that I may not be ſo troubled with wrong, or impertinent allegations, and that I may be ſure that your inſufficient arguings are not from any imperfection of the perſon, but of the Cauſe.

If you meet in theſe Papers with any paſſages which you think too confident and earneſt; I beſeech you charge them not with uncharitableneſs or paſſion, for I hope it proceeded not from either; but I confeſs I am inclined to ſpeak confidently where I am certain, and to ſpeak ſeriouſly about the things of God, which are of everlaſting conſequence.

May 18. 1659.

For Mr. *William Johnſon.*

THE SECOND PART:

Wherein the succeſsive Viſibility of the Church, of which the Proteſtants are chief Members, is clearly proved: And the Papiſts exceptions againſt it confuted.

LONDON,
Printed in the year 1660.

Qu. *Whether the Church, of which the Proteſtants are Members, have been Viſible ever ſince the dayes of Chriſt on earth?* Aff.

THe terms explained.

1. [*The Church*] ſometime ſignifieth a particular Congregation actually met, or aſſociated for ſuch perſonal meeting, for Communion in Gods worſhip. 2. Sometime it ſignifieth an Aſſociation of Churches, and that either of fewer, or of more, as they have opportunity of Communion or correſpondency by their Paſtors; and alſo the Aſſemblies of the Paſtors of the particular Churches ſo aſſociated. Scripture uſeth it in the firſt ſenſe, and Later cuſtome (whether Scripture alſo I omit) in the later. 3. Both Scripture and Cuſtome have uſed the word to ſignifie the Church Univerſal, of which all particular Churches are Members. This is [*the Church*] that we ſpeak of in the Queſtion.

Defin. The Univerſal Church, of which

the Proteſtants profeſs themſelves Members, is, *The Kingdome of Jeſus Chriſt*: or, *The whole company of Believers* (or *true Chriſtians*) *upon earth, ſubjected to Jeſus Chriſt their Head.*] The conſtitutive parts, or the Relate and Correlate are, (as in every Politick Body) the *Pars Imperans*, and *Pars ſubdita*: which is *Chriſt* and *Chriſtians*. The form conſiſteth in the mutuall *Relation*. The *End* is the common good of the Church, and the glory of the Head, and the accompliſhment of the will of God.

2. [The Proteſtants] *Defin.* [*Proteſtants are Chriſtians proteſting againſt*, or *diſowning Popery.*] The word [*Proteſtant*] expreſſeth not the *eſſence* of our Religion. And therefore it muſt not denominate the Univerſal Church, of which we are Members: we are not to call it [A Proteſtant Univerſal Church.] Nor doth it ſignifie an *inſeparable proper accident*. For when the Catholick Church had no Popery, there was none to proteſt againſt, and therefore there could be no Proteſtants. And *Ethiopia*, *India*, and other Nations that never had Popery, or thoſe Nations that never heard of it, have no occaſion to proteſt againſt it. Nor doth it ſignifie any *Poſitive part* (directly) of our Religion: but only the

the Negation, or Rejection of Popery: Even as when a man is called [*Homo purgatus, ſanatus, liberatus, à lepra, peſte, tabe,* &c.] a man purged, healed, freed from the leproſie, plague, conſumption, *&c.* it is no poſitive part, nor inſeparable proper accident, much leſs any eſſential part of the man, that is ſignified by the word [*Healed, Purged,* &c.] Nor is it neceſſary in order to the proving him [a man] or [a healthfull man,] to prove that he was ever [a purged, or healed man.] We undertake not therefore to prove that there have been alwayes *Proteſtants*, that is, men *Proteſting againſt Popery*: Nor have we any need, in order to the proof of our Theſis, to prove that the Catholick Church hath all been free from Popery in all ages, or in any age ſince the Apoſtles, no more then that it hath been free from Pride, Ambition, or Contention. (But yet we ſhall do it *ex abundanti.*) The Religion then of a Proteſtant is *Chriſtianity*, and he knoweth and owneth no other. Which is called [the Proteſtant Religion] as cleanſed from Popery.

[Members] that is, true integral parts.

[Of which---are--] By *Profeſſion.* We profeſs our ſelves to be of no other Church.

And before men, a man is to be taken to be of that Religion and Church of which he profeſſeth himſelf to be, till he be proved falſe in that Profeſſion. If a Papiſt affirm himſelf a member of the Roman Church, in diſputing with him we will take it for granted that he is ſo; every man being beſt acquainted with his own mind, and fitteſt to deſcribe the Religion which he owns. So that two things I here include. 1. It is only ſuch a Catholick Church that hath been ſtill viſible, [that Proteſtants own.] 2. And only ſuch that really they are of, their Profeſſion being valid.

Note alſo, that it is not directly the *inexiſtency* by internal inviſible faith, that is in queſtion among us, or that I mean: but the inexiſtency by external Viſible Profeſſion. *Bellarmine* thinks the *bare Profeſſors* that are wicked, are beſt termed [*Dead members*] and [*the true Profeſſors*, [*Living members*] we will not ſtick needleſly on words: We take the Living members only to be in ſtrict propriety *members*; but *Sincerity* and *Hypocriſie* being known only to God and the poſſeſſors, we ſpeak of *Profeſſors* as *Profeſſors* abſtractively from their *Sincerity* or *Hypocriſie*.

[Hath been Viſible.] 1. Not *viſible* to man

man in its Internal faith; but in its external *Profession.*

2. Not *Visible* at once to any one man: for no man can see all the Christian world at once: But *Visible* in its parts, both in Congregations and individual persons.

3. Not *Visible* in the *soundness* of its *professed faith* unto Infidels and Heretics: For they cannot see that faith to be sound, which they take to be fabulous and false: But *Visible* in the soundness of its professed faith to themselves, that know the soundness of faith.

4. Not *Visible* in the excellent degree of soundness in the better parts, unto the corrupter or infirmer parts: For though *de facto* they may know what Doctrine the better part do hold (as Infidels know what Doctrine the Church holdeth) yet they know it not to be true and sound in the points wherein they differ.

And note again, that it is not the [*Visibility*] of every *accident* of the Church, nor of every Truth or duty that is but of the *Integrity* of Religion, and necessary only *ad melius esse Ecclesiæ*, to the *Better being* of the Church, but it is the [*Visibility*] of the *Church* that we speak of.

Lastly, it is the *Body* and not the *Head*, whose

whoſe *Viſibility* is in Queſtion by us. Though the *Head* alſo is truly *Viſible* in Heaven; and *Viſus*, or ſeen to the moſt excellent Triumphant part of his Body, who are fitteſt to be his Courtiers, and in his preſence: (and as much ſeen on earth, as the Pope is to moſt of the Church, which is not at all.)

[*Ever ſince the dayes of Chriſt on earth.*]

1. But not ſtill in one and the ſame place on earth. It might be in one age much of it in *Judea*, at *Epheſus*, *Sardis*, *Laodicæa*, *Coloſſe*, *Philippi*, and other parts of *Aſia*; and in other ages removed thence, either wholly or for the moſt part: It might be in one age in *Tenduc*, *Nubia*, and other great Kingdoms, where it ſhall after ceaſe to be: But in ſome part or other of the earth it hath been ſtill.

2. Not *equally viſible* in all *Times* and *Places* of the earth. In ſome Times (as in the Arrians prevalency) it was ſo oppreſſed and obſcured, that the world groaned to find it ſelf turn'd Arrian, and the Arrians in General Councils and number of Biſhops (to whom the true Chriſtians were very few.) did ſeem to carry away the Name and glory of the Catholick Church; ſo that in their eyes, and in the eyes of ſtanders by that were of neither party, the moſt Viſible Catholick

tholick Church was theirs: who yet had no part in it, becauſe they were not Chriſtians (as denying that which is eſſentiall to Chriſt, the object of the Chriſtian faith) and therefore none of the Church, and therefore though moſt viſible and numerous, yet not the viſible Church: And the Church, which to others was as wheat hidden in this chaffe, or rather a few ears among ſo many tares, was yet Viſible to it ſelf in its Truth of faith, and viſible to its Enemies in its Profeſſion and aſſemblies, though in number far below them.

So alſo in ſome *places* it may be *Latent* through perſecution & the paucity of believers, when in other places it is more *Patent*.

And its Degrees of ſoundneſs being various, are accordingly variouſly viſible. One part may be really and viſibly more ſtrong, and another more weak in the faith: One part much more corrupt then others, and other parts retain their purity: And the ſame Countries increaſe or decreaſe in that purity, as is apparent in the caſe of the Churches of *Galatia*, *Corinth*, the ſeven Aſian Churches, *Rev.* 2. and 3. *&c.*

Laſtly note, that it is only that part of the Church which is on earth whoſe viſibility we aſſert; though that in Heaven be alſo

alſo a true part of the Body of Chriſt.

Nor is it in the *ſame Individuals* that the Church continueth *Viſible*, but in *ſucceſsive Matter*. So much for explication of the terms.

Theſ. The Church of which the Proteſtants are Members, hath been Viſible ever ſince the dayes of Chriſt on earth.

Arg. 1. The Body of Chriſtians on earth ſubjected to Chriſt their Head, hath been (in its parts) Viſible ever ſince the dayes of Chriſt on earth.

But the Body of Chriſtians on earth ſubjected to Chriſt their Head, is the Church of which the Proteſtants are Members:

Therefore the Church of which the Proteſtants are Members, hath been viſible ever ſince the dayes of Chriſt on earth.

I have not ſagacity enough to conjecture what any Papiſt can ſay againſt the Major propoſition.

The Minor is proved by our own Profeſſions: As the profeſſion of Popery, proveth a man a Papiſt, ſo the profeſſion of Chriſtianity as much proveth us to be Chriſtians.

[«] Thoſe that profeſs the true Chriſtian Religion in all its eſſentials, are Members of that Church which is the Body of Chriſtians on earth ſubjected to Chriſt the Head.

But

But the Proteſtants profeſs the true Chriſtian Religion in all its eſſentialls: therefore the Proteſtants are Members of that Church which is the Body of Chriſtians on earth ſubjected to Chriſt the Head.

The Major is undeniable. The Minor is thus proved. 1. Thoſe that profeſs ſo much as God hath promiſed ſalvation upon in the Covenant of Grace, do profeſs the Chriſtian Religion in all its Eſſentials. (For God promiſeth ſalvation in that Covenant to none but Chriſtians.) But the Proteſtants profeſs ſo much as God hath promiſed ſalvation upon, in the Covenant of Grace:

Therefore the Proteſtants do profeſs the Chriſtian Religion in all its eſſentials.

The Minor is thus proved. All that profeſs faith in God the Father, Son, and holy Ghoſt, our Creator, Redeemer and Sanctifier, and love to him, and abſolute obedience to all his Laws of Nature and holy Scripture, with willingneſs and diligence to know the true meaning of all theſe Laws as far as they are able, and with Repentance for all known ſin, do profeſs ſo much as God hath promiſed ſalvation upon, *Joh.* 3. 16, 17. *Mark* 16. 16. *Heb.* 5. 9 *Rom.* 8. 28. 1. *Act* 26. 18. But ſo do the Proteſtants: Therefore the Proteſtants profeſs

profeſs ſo much as God hath promiſed ſalvation on.

2. Thoſe that profeſs as much and much more of the Chriſtian faith and Religion, as the Catechumens were ordinarily taught in the ancient Churches, and the Competentes at Baptiſm did profeſs, do profeſs the true Chriſtian Religion in all its eſſentials.

But ſo do the Proteſtants: Therefore, *&c.*

3. Thoſe that explicitely profeſs the Belief of all that was contained in the Churches Symbols, or Creeds, for ſix hundred years after Chriſt (and much more holy truth) and implicitly to believe all that is contained in the holy Scriptures, and to be willing and diligent for the explicite knowledge of all the reſt, with a Reſolution to obey all the will of God which they know, do profeſs the true Chriſtian Religion in all its Eſſentials. But ſo do the Proteſtants. Therefore, *&c.*

Ad hominem, I confirm the Major (and moſt that went before) from the Teſtimonies of ſome moſt eminent Papiſts.

Bellarmine ſaith, *de Verbo Dei, lib.* 4. *c.* 11. In the Chriſtian doctrine both of faith and manners, ſome things are ſimply neceſſary to ſalvation to all; as the knowledge of the Articles of the Apoſtles Creed, of the ten Command-

Commandments, and of ſome Sacraments: The reſt are not ſo neceſſary that a man cannot be ſaved without the explicite knowledge, belief, and profeſſion of them—— Theſe things that are ſimply neceſſary, and are profitable to all, the Apoſtles preached to all——All things are written by the Apoſtles which are Neceſſary to all, and which they openly preacht to all——

Coſterus Enchirid. c. 1. *p.* 49. [We deny not, that thoſe chief heads of Belief, which are neceſſary to all Chriſtians to be known to ſalvation, are perſpicuouſly enough comprehended in the writings of the Apoſtles.]

But all this the Proteſtants profeſs to believe.

[C] If ſincere Proteſtants are Members of the true Church, as intrinſecally informed (or as *Bellarmine* ſpeaks, Living Members) then profeſſed Proteſtants are Members of the true Church as extrinſecally denominated (or as it is Viſible, conſiſting of Profeſſors.) But the Antecedent is true: Therefore ſo is the Conſequent.

The Reaſon of the Conſequence is, becauſe it is the ſame thing that is profeſſed by all Profeſſors, and exiſtent in all true Believers: and that as to Profeſſion is neceſſary to Viſibility of Membership; and as

to

to ſincere inexiſtence, is neceſſary to ſalvation.

The Antecedent or Minor I thus prove. All that by faith in Chriſt are brought to the unfeigned Love of God above all, and ſpeciall Love to his ſervants, and unfeigned willingneſs to obey him, are Members of the true Church as intrinſecally informed. But ſuch are all ſincere Proteſtants: Therefore all ſincere Proteſtants are Members of the true Church as intrinſecally informed.

The Major is granted by the Papiſts, who affirm charity to be the form of Grace, and all that have it to be juſtified. And the promiſes of Scripture prove it to our Comfort.

The Minor 1. Is proved to others by our Profeſſions: If this be in our Profeſſion, then the ſincere are ſuch indeed. But this is in our Profeſſion: Therefore, *&c.*

2. Its certainly known to our ſelves by the inward knowledge and ſenſe of our ſouls. I know that I Love God and his ſervants, and am willing to obey him; Therefore all the Papiſts Sophiſms ſhall never make me not know what I do know, and not feel what I do feel. They reaſon in vain with me, when they reaſon againſt the knowledge and experience of my ſoul. Your

ſcope

ſcope is to prove me in a ſtate of damnation. You confeſs that if I have charity I am in a ſtate of ſalvation. I know and feel that I have charity: Therefore I know that your Reaſonings are deceit.

Arg. 2. The Church whoſe faith is contained in the holy Scriptures as its Rule in all points neceſſary to ſalvation, hath been Viſible ever ſince the dayes of Chriſt on earth.

But the Church whoſe faith is contained in the holy Scriptures as its Rule in all points neceſſary to ſalvation, is it of which the Proteſtants are Members.

Therefore the Church of which the Proteſtants are Members, hath been viſible ever ſince the dayes of Chriſt on earth.

That the Catholick Church which hath been Viſible till now, hath received the Holy Scriptures which we receive, is confeſſed by all Papiſts that ever I heard or read making mention of it. And no wonder, for it cannot be denied.

That this Church hath taken theſe Scriptures for the Rule of faith in all points neceſſary to ſalvation (allowing Church-Governours to make Canons about the circumſtantials of Government and worſhip, which in the Univerſal Law are not determined,

mined, but left to humane prudence to determine.) 1. I have proved in my third Diſpute of the *ſafe Religion* already. 2. It is confeſſed by the Papiſts: the forecited paſſages of *Bellarmine* and *Coſterus* are ſufficient. But in the great Council at *Baſil*, *Orat. Raguſ. Bin. p.* 299. it is moſt plainly and with fuller authority aſſerted. [The holy Scripture in the Literal ſenſe, ſoundly and well underſtood, is the infallible and Moſt ſufficient Rule of faith.] See my vindication of this Teſtimony in my *Catholick Key*: and the like from *Card. Richlieu*.

Gerſon ſaith, *de exam. doctr. p.* 2. *cont.* 1. *Nihil audendum dicere de divinis, niſi quæ nobis à ſacra Scriptura tradita ſunt.*

Durandus in his Preface is wholly for the excellency and ſufficiency of the Scriptures. Three wayes, he ſaith, God revealeth himſelf and other things to man: The loweſt way is by the book of the creatures (ſo heathens may know him.) The higheſt is by manifeſt Viſion (as in heaven): and the middle way is in the Book of holy Scripture, without which there is no coming to the higheſt way.] And going on to extoll the Scripture, he citeth *Jeromes* words *ad Paulinum*, [Let us learn on earth the knowledge of thoſe things, which will abide with

us

us in heaven:] But this is only (ſaith he) in the holy Scripture.] And after *ex Hierom. ad Marcell.* [If Reaſon be brought againſt the authority of the Scriptures, how acute ſoever it is, it cannot be true:] And after [We muſt ſpeak of the myſterie of Chriſt, and univerſally of thoſe things that meerly concern faith, conformably to what the holy Scripture delivereth: So Chriſt, *John* 5. Search the Scriptures, It is they that teſtifie of me. If any obſerve not this, he ſpeaks not of the myſterie of Chriſt, and of other things directly touching faith as he ought, but falls into that of the Apoſtle, 1 *Cor.* 8. If any man think he knoweth any thing, he yet knoweth nothing as he ought to know. For the meaſure is not to exceed the meaſure of faith: of which the Apoſtle bids us, *Rom.* 12. Not to be wiſer then we ought to be, but to be wiſe to ſobriety, and as God hath divided to every man the meaſure of faith. Which *Meaſure* conſiſteth in two things; to wit, that we ſubtract not from faith that which is of faith, nor (N.B.) attribute that to faith which is not of faith: For by either of theſe wayes, the meaſure of faith is exceeded, and men deviate from the continence of the ſacred Scripture, which expreſſeth the meaſure of faith.]

(That is, from the full ſufficiency of the Scripture meaſure:) [And this meaſure, by Gods aſſiſtance, we will hold, that we may write or teach nothing diſſonant to the holy Scripture. But if by ignorance or inadvertency, we ſhould write any thing diſſonant, let it be taken *ipſo facto* as not written.] This is a confeſſion of the Religion of the Proteſtants. And though he adjoyn a ſubmiſſion to the Roman Church, becauſe he was bred in it, it is only as to an interpreter of doubtfull Texts of Scripture: So that the ſufficiency of our Rule and meaſure of faith is granted by him, and zealouſly aſſerted; and that without *Bellarmine* and *Coſterus* limitation, to points neceſſary to the ſalvation of all; he extendeth it to all the faith.

Aquin. 22. *q.*1. *a.*10. *ad* 1. ſaith, [That in the Doctrine of Chriſt and his Apoſtles, the truth of the faith is ſufficiently explicated:] even when he is pleading for the Popes power to make new Creeds to obviate errours.

And in his *ſum. de Verit. diſp. de fide q.*10. *ad* 11. he ſaith, [That all the means by which the faith cometh to us are free from ſuſpicion. The Prophets and Apoſtles we believe, for this reaſon, becauſe God bore them

them witneſs by working Miracles: as *Mar.* 16. confirming their ſpeech with following ſigns: But their ſucceſſors we believe not, but ſo far as they declare to us thoſe things which they have left us in the Scripture.] This is the Religion of the Proteſtants.

Scotus in Prolog. in ſent. 1. makes it his ſecond Queſtion, Whether ſupernaturall knowledge neceſſary to us in the Way, be ſufficiently delivered in the holy Scripture, which he proveth (having firſt given ten arguments to prove the Truth of Scripture.) And firſt he ſhews it containeth the Doctrine of the End, and 2. of the things neceſſary to that end, and the ſufficiency of them; ſummarily in the Decalogue, explained in the other Scriptures, as to matter of faith, hope, and practice; and ſo concludes, that the holy Scripture ſufficiently containeth the doctrine neceſſary *viatori*, to us in the way: And he anſwereth the objection, of *Difficulties in it*, (without flying to the Church) that [no ſcience explaineth all things to be known, but thoſe things from which the reſt may conveniently be gathered: and ſo many needfull truths are not expreſſed in Scripture; though they are virtually there contained, as concluſions in the Principles, about the in-

veſtigation whereof the labour of Expoſitors and Doctors hath been profitable.] This is his doctrine out of *Origen*.

Gregor. Ariminenſis in Prol. q. 1. *act.* 2. *Reſp. ad act. fol.* 3. *&* 4. ſaith [A diſcourſe properly Theologicall, is that which conſiſteth of words or propoſitions contained in the holy Scripture; or of thoſe that are deduced from them; or at leaſt from one of theſe: This is proved 1. by the forealledged authority of *Dionyſ.* For he will have it, that there can be no leading of that man to Theologicall ſcience, that aſſenteth not to the ſayings of the holy Scripture.——It ſollows therefore that no diſcourſe that proceedeth not from the words of holy Scripture, or of that which is deduced from them, is Theologicall.]——[2. The ſame is proved from the common conception of all men: For all men judge that then only is any thing proved Theologically, when they prove it from the words of the holy Scripture.]

This is more then the former ſay: For to extend the ſufficiency and neceſſity of Scripture to all thats Theologicall, is more then to extend it to matter of faith. No Proteſtant goeth higher then this that I know of. And note, that he makes this the very

very common conception and judgement of all men. See then where our Religion and Church was before *Luther!* even among all Christians.

Yet more fully he proceeds (*ibid.*) [Hence it further appeareth, that Principles of Theology thus taken, that is, which is acquired by Theologicall discourse, are the very Truths themselves of the holy Canon, because the ultimate Resolution of all Theologicall discourse doth stand (or belong) to them; and all Theologicall conclusions are deduced first from them. But distinguishing the Conclusions Theologicall from the Principles, I say that all truths are not in themselves formally contained in the holy Scripture: but of necessity following from those that are contained in them: and this whether they are Articles of faith, or not (NB); and whether they are knowable or known by another science, or not: and whether they are determined by the Church or not. But of other Truths, to wit, not following from the words of the holy Scripture, I say there is no Theologicall conclusion: This is proved, *&c.*——]

When I read over the Schoolmen and Divines of all sorts, that wrote before the Reformers fell so closely upon the Pope, and

[find how generally even the Papiſts themſelves maintained the ſufficiency of the holy Scripture, juſt as the Proteſtants now do, I am convinced 1. of the ſucceſſion of the Proteſtants Religion in the Univerſal Viſible Church; and 2. that it was the Reformers Arguments from Scripture, that forced the Papiſts to oppoſe this holy Rule, as to its ſufficiency; and to invent the new doctrine of ſupplementall Tradition; (for conſervative, Miniſteriall Tradition of the holy Scriptures we are for as much, at leaſt, as they.)

The words of *Guil. Pariſienſis*, too large to be recited, in extolling the fulneſs and perfection of the Scripture, even for all ſorts of men, you may read, *de Legibus, cap.* 16. *pag.* 46.

Bellarmine de Verbo Dei, lib. 3. *cap.* 10. *ad Arg.* 15. ſaith [We muſt know that a Propoſition of faith is concluded in ſuch a ſyllogiſm: Whatſoever God hath revealed in Scripture is true: But this God hath revealed in Scripture: Therefore it is true.] (Though he require another word of God by the Pope, or Council, to prove that this is revealed in Scripture.) But if ſo, then Scripture containeth all thats true in points of faith.

2. And

2. And that all things that are revealed, and which we ought to believe, are not Eſſentiall to the Chriſtian faith, and therefore that all are of the Church that hold theſe Eſſentialls, and that ſuch a diſtinction muſt be maintained, the Papiſts have ſtill confeſſed, till lately, that diſputing hath encreaſed their novelties and errours.

Bellarmines and *Coſterus* confeſſion, I recited even now.

Guliel. Pariſienſis in Operum pag. 9, 10, 11, 12. *de fide*, induſtriouſly proveth the neceſſity of diſtinguiſhing the fundamentalls or eſſentialls, from the reſt of the points of faith: and it is they that conſtitute the Catholick faith, which he ſaith is therefore called Catholick or Univerſal, becauſe it is the common faith, or the common foundation of Religion: And he proves that hence it is that the Catholick faith is but One, and found in all Catholicks, theſe fundamentalls being found in all.] By many arguments he proveth this.

And that there are ſome points, even theſe common Articles neceſſary to be known of all, *neceſſitati medii*, the Schoolmen commonly grant: as *Aquin.* 22. *q.* 2. *a.* 5. *c. Bannes in* 22. *q.* 2. *a.* 8. *&c.* Of theſe ſaith *Eſpencæus* (in 2. *Ti. c.* 3. *dig.* 17.) which

which are the objects of faith *per ſe*, and not the ſecondary objects, the adult muſt have an explicite faith, and the Colliers faith at this time decantate by the Catholicks, will not ſerve the turn.]

And we have both the Scripture ſufficiency to all points of faith, even the loweſt, and alſo the foreſaid diſtinction given us together, by *Tho. Aquinas* 22. *q. art.* 5. *c.* [We muſt ſay, that the object of faith *per ſe*, is that by which man is made bleſſed: But by accident and ſecondarily, all things are the object of faith which are contained in the holy Scripture.]

See the judgement of *Occham*, *Canus*, *Tolet*, and many more cited by Dr. *Potter*; and yet more for the ſufficiency of the Symbole or Creed, as the teſt of Chriſtianity, *pag.* 89, 90, 91, 92, 93. Where you have the ſenſe of the Ancients upon the point, and *p.* 102, 103.

I conclude therefore with the Jeſuite *Azorius*, *par.* 1. *lib.* 8. *c.* 6. [The ſubſtance of the Article in which we believe One, holy, Catholick Church, is, that no man can be ſaved out of the Congregation of men profeſſing the reception of the faith and Religion of Chriſt, and that ſalvation may be obtained within this ſame Congregation of godly and faithfull men. And

And as to the Eſſence of the Chriſtian faith and Church, we ſay with *Tertullian* of the Symbole [*Fides in Regula poſita eſt: habes legem, & ſalutem ex obſervatione legis: exercitatio autem in curioſitate conſiſtit, habens gloriam ſolam ex peritiæ ſtudio: Cedat curioſitas fidei: Cedat gloria ſaluti. Certe aut non obſtrepant, aut quieſcant adverſus regulam: Nihil ultra ſcire, eſt omnia ſcire.*] That is, [Faith lieth in the Rule: Here you have the Law, and ſalvation in the obſervation of that Law; but it is exerciſe that conſiſteth in curioſity, having only (a name or) glory by the ſtudy of skill; Let curioſity give place to faith: Let glory give place to ſalvation. Let them not prate, or let them be quiet, againſt the Rule. To know nothing further, is to know all things.] *De Præſcript. cap.* 13, 14.

So *cap.* 8. *Nobis curioſitate opus non eſt poſt Chriſtum Jeſum, nec inquiſitione poſt Evangelium. Cum credimus, nihil deſideramus ultra credere; hoc enim prius credimus, non eſſe quod ultra credere debeamus.*] That is, [As for us we need not curioſity after Jeſus Chriſt, nor inquiſition after the Goſpel: When we believe, we need to believe no further: For we firſt believe this, that there is nothing further that we ought to believe.] And

And here (on the by) for the right underſtanding of *Tertullians* Book *de Præſcript.* note, 1. That the Rule of Eſſentialls extracted from the whole Scripture, is the Churches ancient Creed. 2. That the compleat Rule of all points of faith is the whole Scripture. And that *Tertullian* had to do with Hereticks that denied the Eſſentials, and deſired the whole Scripture to diſpute their caſe from both, becauſe they had queſtioned or rejected much of it; and becauſe it was a larger field to exerciſe their wits in, and whence they might gather more matter of diſpute to puzzle the weak: And therefore *Tertullian* adviſeth the ordinary Chriſtians of his time, inſtead of long puzzling diſputes with them out of Scripture, to hold them to the Churches preſcription, of the ſimple doctrine of the Creed. But now come in the Papiſts; and 3. will neither be content with Creed nor Scripture, but muſt have a Church or faith partly made up of ſupplemental Traditions, of more then is in all the Scripture, and ſo run further from *Tertullian* and the ancient ſimplicity, then theſe Hereticks, and yet are not aſhamed to glory in this Book of *Tertullian* as for them.

Of the Fathers judgement of the Scripture

pture ſufficiency, ſee the third part of my [*ſafe Religion*] where I have produced Teſtimonies enough to prove the Antiquity of the Proteſtants Religion, and the Novelty of Popery. But nothing can be ſo plain and full, which pre-engaged men dare not deny. Let me inſtance but in one or two paſſages of *Auguſtine*, ſo plain as might put an end to the whole Controverſie.

Aug. de Doctr. Chriſtian. lib. 2. c. 9. [*In his omnibus libris timentes Deum & pietate manſueti, quærunt voluntatem Dei. Cujus operis & laboris prima obſervatio eſt, ut diximus, noſſe iſtos libros, & ſi nondum ad intellectum legendo tamen vel mandare memoriæ,* (He was not againſt the Vulgars reading Scripture) *vel omnino incognitos non habere. Deinde illa quæ in eis aperte poſita ſunt, vel præcepta vivendi vel regulæ credendi, ſolertiùs diligentiúſque inveſtiganda ſunt: Quæ tanto quiſque plura invenit, quanto eſt intelligentia capacior: In iis enim quæ apertè in Scriptura poſita ſunt, inveniuntur illa omnia quæ continent fidem moreſque vivendi,* (N. B.) *ſpem ſcilicet atque charitatem, de quibus libro ſuperiore tractavimus. Tum verò facta quadam familiaritate cum ipſa lingua divinarum ſcripturarum, in ea quæ obſcura ſunt aperienda, & diſcutienda pergendum eſt, ut*

ad

ad obſcuriores locutiones illuſtrandas de manifeſtationibus ſumantur exempla, & quædam certarum ſententiarum teſtimonia, dubitationem de incertis auferant.] You ſee here that the Scripture, as ſufficient to faith and manners, to be read by all that fear God, and can read; and the harder places to be expounded by the plainer, was the ancient Rule of faith and Religion: And this is the Religion of Proteſtants.

Aug. lib.3.c.6. contra lit. Petiliani, pag. 127. [*Proinde, ſive de Chriſto ſive de ejus Eccleſia, ſive de quacunque alia re quæ pertinet ad fidem vitamque noſtram, non dicam* Nos, *nequaquam comparandi ei qui dixit* [*Licet ſi nos*] *ſed omnino quod ſecutus adjecit, ſi Angelus de cœlo vobis annunciaverit præterquam quod in Scripturis & Evangelicis acceperitis, Anathema ſit.*] I muſt needs Engliſh this ſhort paſſage, to the utter confuſion of Popery. [And therefore whether it be of Chriſt, or whether it be of the Church, or whether it be of any other matter that pertaineth to our Faith or Life, I will not ſay [*if we*] as being not worthy to be compared with him that ſaid [*Though we*] but (I will ſay) plainly what he added following: [If an Angel from heaven ſhall declare to you any thing beſides that which you have

received

received in the Legall and Evangelicall Scriptures, let him be Anathema, or accurſed.] Was not the Church then purely Proteſtant in their Religion?

The Minor needs no proof but our own Profeſſion. My profeſſion is the beſt evidence of my own Religion to another: And I profeſs this to be my Religion; which is contained in the holy Scripture, as the Teſt, or Law, or Rule. And let no man contradict me, that knoweth not my Religion better then I do: The Articles of the Church of *England* profeſs this alſo to be the Religion of the Compoſers. And the Proteſtants commonly *uno ore* do profeſs it. It is the great difference between us and the Papiſts. The whole Univerſal Law of God that we know of, and own, is contained in Nature and Scripture conjunct. But the Papiſts take ſomewhat elſe to be another part. We allow by-Laws about mutable undetermined things (as aforeſaid) to Governours: But we know no Univerſal Law of faith and holineſs, but Nature and Scripture: This is our Religion: And this Religion contained in Nature and Scriptures hath been ſtill received.

Obj. We confeſs Scripture is ſufficient to them that have no further light: All that is neceſſary

neceſſary to the ſalvation of all, is in that perſpicuouſly, as *Coſterus*, *Bellarmine*, and others ſay: but more is neceſſary to ſalvation to ſome.

Anſ. 1. Then at leaſt it containeth all the Eſſentialls of Chriſtianity, which ſufficeth to our preſent end. 2. And what maketh more Neceſſary to me, or others here in *England*, if it be not neceſſary to all? Is it becauſe that more is Revealed to us? But *how* and by whom; and with what *Evidence*? We are willing to ſee it, and can ſee no ſuch thing: But if this be it, (if I may ſpeak ſo plainly without offence) it ſeems it concerneth us to keep out Friars and Jeſuites from the Land, as much (if we knew how) as to keep out the Devil. For they tell us, 1. That we muſt believe the Popes Soveraignty, againſt the Tradition and judgement of moſt of the Catholick Church. 2. And we muſt believe our ſelves to be void of Charity (becauſe no Papiſts) contrary to our internall ſenſe and knowledge. 3. And we muſt believe that bread is not bread, and wine is not wine, contrary to the common ſenſes of all ſound men: and if we will not thus renounce the Churches Vote, Tradition, our Certain knowledge, Reaſon, and all our Senſes, we muſt be damned:

damned: where as before this doctrine was brought us, we might have been saved, as having in the Scriptures all things necessary to the salvation of all.

But the Papists must needs have us shew them where our Church was, and name the persons. *Answ.* 1. It were not the Catholike Church, if it were confined to any place that is but a part of the Christian territories. 2. Nor were it the Catholike Church if we could name half or a considerable part of the members: As *Augustin* oft tells the *Donatists*, it is the Church which begun at *Jerusalem*, and thence is spread throughout the world. Part of it may be in one Nation one year, which may forfeit and lose it before the next. God hath not tyed it to any place. 3. To tell you where the Catholike Church hath been in every age, and who were the Members or the Leaders, requireth much knowledge in History and Cosmography, which God hath not made necessary to salvation. 4. There are no known Histories that deliver us the Catalogues of the Christians in every age of the world. Had any been so foolish as to write them, they would have been too chargeable to keep, and too long to read: yea were it but of the Pastors

5. God hath nowhere commanded the Church to keep ſuch Catalogues or Hiſtories, nor promiſed when they are written, that Papiſts ſhall not purpoſely corrupt and deſtroy them, nor *Turks* (as at *Buda*) take the Chriſtian Libraries, and burn them. 6. Papiſts cannot prove the ſucceſſive extent and habitations of the Catholike Church any more then we; and we can do it as well as they: for we have the ſame means. If they can tell us where it hath been in every age, they need not ask us: If they cannot, they have as much need to learn as we, and much more. They think it not neceſſary to their Laity, to the proving of their faith, to be able to prove the habitations or names of the Members of the Catholike Church in all ages: and why is it more neceſſary to us then them? 7. But yet, to men acquainted with hiſtory, what can be more eaſie, then to tell you where great multitudes of Chriſtians in all ages have inhabited, and where many parts of the Church have been, though no man can give you a Catalogue of the Church, any more then of the world?

Would you know then where our Church, that is, the Catholike Church hath been, in all ages? why it hath been in *Aſia*, *Africa*

Africa and *Europe*. Is that too general? It hath been in *Syria*, in *Meſopotamia*, *Parthia*, *Media*, *Armenia*, *India*, *Perſia*, in *Egypt*, *Habaſſia*, *Georgia*, *Cilicia*, *Circaſſia*, *Mingrelia*, *Natolia*, *Iſauria*, *Thrace*, and more other Countries, then I have any need to name to you, (to ſay nothing of *Europe*, and *Brittain* by name, as a thing moſt known). But no man well in his wits will deny a ſucceſſion of the Chriſtian Church which I have defined, from the firſt plantation of it until now. If Chriſtianity had ever ceaſed in the world, how came it to be new planted, and revived?

That this before deſcribed is the only Catholike Church that hath been owned by the ancient Doctors, appeareth by their conſtant witneſſes. To cite a few, and yet enough.

Auguſt. in Pſal. 21. *Ubicunque timetur Deus & laudatur, ibi eſt Eccleſia.*

Id. Epiſt. 50. *In Sanctis Libris ubi manifeſtatur Dominus Chriſtus, ibi & ejus Eccleſia declaratur* (and therefore there it muſt be ſought) *Iſti autem mirabili cæcitate, cum ipſum Chriſtum præter Scripturas neſciant, ejus tamen Eccleſiam non divinarum authoritate cognoſcunt, ſed humanarum calumniarum vanitate confingunt.* Chriſt

is to be known in the Scripture, and therefore ſo is the Church.

Ibid. *In cauſa Cæciliani —— ſe ab Eccleſia Catholica, hoc eſt, ab unitate omnium gentium diviſerunt.* Its not the Catholick Church becauſe *Roman*, but becauſe extended to *all Nations*. *Sed tamen Eccleſiam, quæ non litigioſis opinionibus fingitur, ſed Divinis atteſtationibus comprobatur, propter quemlibet hominem relinquere non debemus.*

Id. In Pſal. 56. *Corpus ejus eſt Eccleſia: non autem iſta aut illa, ſed toto Orbe diffuſa: Nec ea quæ nunc eſt in hominibus qui præſentem vitam agunt, ſed ad eam pertinentibus, etiam his qui fuerunt ante nos, & his qui futuri ſunt poſt nos, uſque in finem ſeculi. Tota enim Eccleſia conſtans ex omnibus fidelibus, quia fideles omnes membra ſunt Chriſti, habet illud Caput poſitum in cœleſtibus quod gubernat corpus ſuum, etſi ſeparatum eſt à viſione, ſed annectitur charitate.*]

Id. Enchirid. ad Laurent. c. 56. *Eccleſia tanquam habitatori domus ſua, & Deo templum ſuum, & conditori civitas ſua: quæ tota hic accipienda eſt, non ſolum ex parte quæ peregrinatur in terris, à ſolis ortu uſque ad occaſum laudans nomen domini.*]

Id. contr. Petilian. cap. 2. Purpoſely opening

opening the true nature of the Catholick Church for the ſtating of the Caſe, ſaith, [*Quæſtio certè inter nos verſatur, ubi ſit Eccleſia? utrum apud nos, an apud illos? Quæ utique Una eſt, quam majores noſtri Catholicam nominarunt, ut ex ipſo nomine oſtenderent, quia per totum eſt.* —— *Hæc autem Eccleſia Corpus Chriſti eſt: ſicut Apoſtolus dicit,* [*pro corpore ejus, quæ eſt Eccleſia.*] *Unde utique manifeſtum eſt, eum qui non eſt in membris Chriſti, Chriſtianam ſalutem habere non poſſe. Membra vero Chriſti per unitatis charitatem ſibi copulantur, & per eandem capiti ſuo adhærent quod eſt Chriſtus Jeſus.* —— *Quæſtio eſt, ubi ſit hoc corpus,* i. e. *ubi ſit Eccleſia? Quid ergo facturi ſumus? in Verbis noſtris eam quæſituri? an in Verbis capitis ſui Domini noſtri Jeſu Chriſti? Puto quod in illius potius verbis eam quærere debemus, qui veritas eſt, & optime novit corpus ſuum* —— After he calls the Church over and over, *Univerſum Orbem Chriſtianum* —— cap. 3. *Quia nolo humanis documentis, ſed divinis oraculis ſanctam Eccleſiam demonſtrari. Si ſancta Scriptura in* Africa *ſolâ*, &c. —— *Si autem Chriſti Eccleſia Canonicarum Scripturarum Divinis & certiſſimis teſtimoniis in omnibus gentibus deſignata eſt, quicquid attulerint* (N. B.) *& un-*

dicunque recitaverint, qui dicunt, [*Ecce hic Chriſtus, ecce illic*] *audiamus potius, ſi oves ejus ſumus, vocem paſtoris noſtri dicentis* [*Nolite credere.*] —— Cap. 4. *Totus Chriſtus Caput & Corpus eſt: Caput unigenitus Dei filius, & Corpus ejus Eccleſia, ſponſus & ſponſa; duo in carne una: Quicunque de ipſo capite ab Scripturis ſanctis diſſentiunt, etiamſi in omnibus locis inveniantur in quibus Eccleſia deſignata eſt, non ſunt in Eccleſia: & rurſus quicunque de ipſo capite Scripturis Sanctis conſentiunt, & Unitati Eccleſiæ non communicant,* (or as after) *ab ejus corpore quod eſt Eccleſia ita diſſentiunt, ut eorum communio non ſit cum toto quacunque diffunditur, ſed in aliqua parte ſeparata inveniatur, manifeſtum eſt eos non eſſe in Catholica Eccleſia.*] (A ſad concluſion to the Papiſts.)

It would be tedious to recite half that *Auſtin* there hath to this purpoſe. Through all his exquiſite diſputes with the Donatiſts, he ſtill deſcribeth the Church, 1. As being the Body of Chriſt, its Head. 2. As diſperſed through the world, and containing all the Members of Chriſt. 3. And that which begun at *Jeruſalem*. 4. And is to be known by the word of God: Never mentioning the Headſhip of the Pope, nor the Miſtriſſhip of *Rome*: of which more anon.

So

So Optatus lib. 2. adverſ. Parmen. *Ubi ergo erit proprietas Catholici nominis, cum inde dicta ſit Catholica, quod ſit rationabilis & ubique diffuſa*, &c.] And before (*p.* 46.) *Ergo Eccleſia una eſt, cujus ſanctitas de ſacramentis colligitur; non de ſuperbia perſonarum ponderatur*: He glorieth indeed in the chair of *Peter*, and the Roman Church and ſucceſſion, as being on the Catholicks ſide; but never maketh them an Eſſentiall part of the Catholick Church, nor talks of a Unity cauſed by ſubjection to them, but *Charity* to all: And therefore calls the Schiſmaticks, *lib.* 3. *p.* 72. *Charitatis deſertores*, not *ſubjectionis deſertores*: Adding, *gaudet totus Orbis de Unitate Catholica*; but never *de ſubjectione* Romæ. Yea he ſaith more of the ſeven Aſian Churches, *lib.* 2. *p.* 50. *Extra ſeptem Eccleſias quicquid foris eſt, alienum eſt.* Never more (it ſo much) can be found to be ſaid of *Rome*: and now *Rome* it ſelf is *extra ſeptem Eccleſias*. So he ſuppoſeth God praiſing the Catholick, *p.* 77. *lib.* 4. *Diſſentio & ſchiſma tibi diſplicuit; Concordaſti cum fratre tuo, & cum una Eccleſia, quæ eſt in toto orbe terrarum: Communicaſti ſeptem Eccleſiis & memoriis Apoſtolorum: amplexus es unitatem.* So *lib.* 6. *p.* 95. he thus deſcribeth the Catholick

Communion. [*An quia voluntatem & juſſionem Dei ſecuti ſumus amando pacem, communicando toti orbi terrarum, ſocietati Orientalibus, ubi ſecundum hominem ſuum natus eſt Chriſtus, ubi ejus ſancta ſunt impreſſa veſtigia, ubi ambulaverunt adorandi pedes, ubi ab ipſo facta ſunt tot & tanta virtutes, ubi eum ſunt tot Apoſtoli comitati, ubi eſt ſeptiformis Eccleſia, à qua vos conciſos eſſe*, &c.]

Tertullian dealing with Hereticks indeed, that denyed the Fundamentals, thought it but a tireſome way to diſpute with them out of Scripture, who wreſted ſo many things in it to their deſtruction, but would have them convinced by Preſcription: becauſe they lived near the Churches that were planted by the Apoſtles, and near their daies: And what doth he? appeal to *Rome*, as the Judge, or Church that the reſt are ſubjected to? No: but 1. It is the common Creed or Symbole of the Church, that he would have made uſe of in ſtead of long diſputes (and not any other doctrine.) 2. And it is all the Churches planted by the Apoſtles, that he will have to be the firſt witneſſes. 3. And the preſent Churches, the immediate witneſſes that they received this Creed (not any ſupernumeraries) from

from them, as the Apoſtles doctrine. So *de præſcript. c.* 13. he reciteth the Symbole it ſelf, and ſo *cap.* 20. he mentioneth the ſending of the twelve to teach this faith, and plant Churches, which he deſcribeth thus [*Statim igitur Apoſtoli—— primo per Judæam conteſtata fide in Jeſum Chriſtum, & Eccleſiis inſtitutis, dehinc in orbem profecti, eandem doctrinam ejuſdem fidei nationibus promulgaverunt, & proinde Eccleſias apud unamquamque civitatem condiderunt, à quibus traducem fidei & ſemina doctrinæ cæteræ exinde Eccleſiæ mutuatæ ſunt, & quotidie mutuantur ut Eccleſiæ fiant. Ac per hoc & ipſæ Apoſtolicæ deputantur ut ſoboles Apoſtolicarum Eccleſiarum. Omne genus ad Originem ſuam cenſeatur, neceſſe eſt. Itaque tot ac tantæ Eccleſiæ una eſt illa ab Apoſtolis prima, ex qua omnes.* (Are not thoſe too groſs deceivers that would perſwade us that he here meaneth the Church of *Rome* by the [*una illa*], when he plainly ſpeaks of the Catholick Church of the Apoſtolick age from which all the reſt did ſpring? If of a particular Church, it muſt be that of *Jeruſalem.* Did all the reſt ariſe from *Rome*? Can they ſay [*ex hac omnes?*] *Sic omnes primæ, & omnes Apoſtolicæ, dum unam omnes probant unitatem. Communicatio pacis, & appellatio*

appellatio fraternitatis, & conteſſeratio hoſpitalitatis, quæ jura non alia ratio regit, quam ejuſdem ſacramenti una traditio.]

Note here 1. That no Original Church is mentioned but thoſe of *Judæa*, with the reſt of the Apoſtles planting. And 2. That the Churches planted by the Apoſtles themſelves, (without any mentioned difference of ſuperiority) are that one Church which all the reſt muſt try their faith by, as the witneſſes 3. That they are equally made *traduces fidei*, and mother Churches to others propagated by them. 4. That *per hoc*, by this propagation (without ſubjection to the Church or Pope of *Rome*) all the reſt are Apoſtolicall. 5. And the ſufficient proof to any Church then that it was *prima & Apoſtolica*, was (not ſubjection to *Rome* but) that *unam omnes probant unitatem.* That is, of the Apoſtolick faith, received from that one Apoſtolick Church. 6. Yea when he reciteth the external Characters of the Church, it is not ſubjection to *Rome*, that is any one of them, but, *Communicatio pacis, appellatio fraternitatis, conteſſeratio hoſpitalitatis.*] 7. Yea utterly to exclude the Roman ſubjection, he adds [*quæ jura non alia ratio regit, quam ejuſdem ſacramenti una traditio.*]

So

So he proceeds *Si hæc ita ſunt, conſtat proinde omnem doctrinam, quæ cum illis Eccleſiis Apoſtolicis matricibus & originalibus fidei conſpiret, veritati deputandum id ſine dubio tenentem, quod Eccleſiæ ab Apoſtolis, Apoſtoli à Chriſto, Chriſtus a Deo ſuſcepit; reliquam verò omnem doctrinam de mendacio præjudicandam, quæ ſapiat contra veritatem Eccleſiarum, & Apoſtolorum, & Chriſti, & Dei. Supereſt ergo ut demonſtremus, an hæc noſtra doctrina* (the Creed; not the Popes additions) *cujus regulam ſupra edidimus, de Apoſtolorum traditione cenſeatur, & ex hoc ipſo, an cæteræ* (that contradict the Creed) *de mendacio veniant. Communicamus cum Eccleſiis Apoſtolicis* (*Rome* is not made the ſtandard) *quod nulla doctrina diverſa, hoc eſt teſtimonium veritatis.*

And *cap.* 28. he doth not ſend us to the Roman Church as Head or Judge, but calling the Holy Ghoſt only, *Vicarius Chriſti*, Chriſts Vicar, makes it incredible that he ſhould ſo far neglect his office, as to let (not *Rome*, but) all the Churches to loſe the Apoſtles doctrine; proving the certain ſucceſſion of it, by the Unity, and not by *Romes* authority [*Ecquid veriſimile eſt, ut tot ac tantæ in unam fidem erraverint? Nullus inter multos eventus eſt unus exitus: Variaſſe*

aſſe debuerat error doctrinæ Eccleſiarum. Cæterum quod apud multos unum invenitur, non eſt erratum, ſed traditum. Audeat ergo aliquis dicere, illos erraſſe qui tradiderunt?

So c. 32. when he calls them to the Apoſtolical Church, it is no more to *Rome*, then another. *Ædant ergo origines Eccleſiarum ſuarum —— ut primus ille Epiſcopus aliquis ex Apoſtolis vel Apoſtolicis viris, qui tamen cum Apoſtolis perſeveraverint, habuerit auctorem, & anteceſſorem. Hoc enim modo Eccleſiæ Apoſtolicæ cenſus ſuos deferunt: ſicut Smyrnæorum Eccleſia habens Polycarpum ab Johanne Collocatum refert; ſicut Romanorum Clementem a Petro ordinatum edit: proinde utique & cæteræ exhibent*] Here you ſee he puts *Smyrna* before *Rome*, and *John* before *Peter*, and refers them to *Rome*, but only as one of the Churches planted by the Apoſtles; and this is but to know their doctrine, delivered in that firſt age, which we appeal to.

And after he expreſly ſaith [*Ad hanc itaque formam, provocabantur ab illis Eccleſiis, quæ licet nullum ex Apoſtolis, vel Apoſtolicis auctorem ſuum proferant, ut multo poſteriores, quæ denique quotidie inſtituuntur; tamen in eadem fidem conſpirantes, non minus*

Apoſto-

Apoſtolicæ deputantur pro conſanguinitate doctrinæ :] The Apoſtles doctrine will prove an Apoſtolical Church, when ever planted.

And *c.* 38. he draws them from diſputing from the Scripture, becauſe they owned not the true Scripture, but corrupted it, and charged the Catholikes with corruption [*Sicut illis non potuit ſuccedere corruptela doctrinæ ſine corruptela inſtrumentorum ejus : Ita & nobis integritas doctrinæ non competiſſet, ſine integritate eorum* (not by real tradition alone) *per quæ doctrina tractatur : Etenim quid contrarium nobis in noſtris ? quid de proprio intulimus, ut aliquid contrarium ei & in Scripturis deprehenſum, detractione vel adjectione vel tranſumtatione remediaremus ? Quod ſumus, hoc ſunt. Ab initio ſuo ex illis ſumus ; antequam nihil aliter fuit, quam ſumus.*]

And *cap.* 36. He ſends them by name to the particular Apoſtolical Churches, and begins with *Corinth* ; then to *Philippi*, *Theſſalonica*, *Epheſus*, and then to *Rome*, of whoſe Soveraignty he never ſpeaks a ſyllable.

So more plainly *l.* 4. *contr. Marcion. c.* 5. becauſe *Marcion* denied the true Scriptures, he ſends them to the Apoſtolike Churches

Churches for the true Scriptures, firſt to the *Corinthians*, then to the *Galatians*, then to the *Philippians*, *Theſſalonians*, *Epheſians*, and laſt of all to *Rome*.

But it would be tedious to cite the reſt of the Ancients, that commonly deſcribe the Church as we; and ſuch as we all own as members of it.

Arg. 3. If the *Roman* Church (as Chriſtian, though not as Papal) hath been viſible ever ſince the daies of the Apoſtles, then the Church of which the Proteſtants are members, hath been viſible ever ſince the daies of the Apoſtles: But the Antecedent is their own; therefore they may not deny the conſequent.

The conſequence alſo is paſt denyal. 1. Becauſe the *Roman* as Chriſtian, is part of the univerſal Chriſtian Church. 2. Becauſe they profeſs to believe the ſame holy Scriptures and Creed as we do. So that though they add more, and ſo make a new form to their Church, yet do they not deny our Church, which is the Chriſtian Church as ſuch, nor our Teſt and Rule of faith, nor any Article that we account Eſſential to our Religion. So that themſelves are our ſufficient witneſſes.

Well! but this will not ſatisfie the Papiſts,

piſts, unleſs we ſhew a ſucceſſion of our Church as Proteſtant.

1. This we need not, any more then a ſound man lately cured of the Plague, doth need to prove, that he hath ever been, not only *ſanus* but *ſanatus*, a cured man (before he was ſick.) How could there be a Church proteſting againſt an univerſal Vicar of Chriſt, before any claimed that Vicarſhip? 2. And when the Vicarſhip was uſurped, thoſe millions, abroad, and even within the *Roman* territories, that let the pretended Vicar talk, and followed their own buſineſs, and never conſented to his uſurpation, were of the very ſame Religion with thoſe that openly proteſted againſt him: And ſo were thoſe that never heard of his uſurpation.

Object. But at leaſt, (ſay they) you muſt prove a Church that hath been without the univerſal Vicar negatively, though not againſt him poſitively.

Anſw. 1. In all reaſon, he that affirmeth muſt prove: It is not incumbent on us to prove the negative, that the Church had not ſuch a *Roman* head; but they muſt prove that it had.

Object. But they have poſſeſſion, and therefore you that would diſpoſſeſs them, muſt diſprove their title. *Anſ.*

Anſ. 1. This is nothing to moſt of the Catholike Church where they have no poſſeſſion: therefore with them they confeſs themſelves obliged to the proof. 2. This is a meer fallacious diverſion: for we are not now upon the queſtion of their Title, but the matter of fact and hiſtory: we make good the negative, that they have no Title from the Laws of Chriſt himſelf: and ſo will not diſpoſſeſs them without diſproving their pretended Title. But when the queſtion is *de facto*, whether they have ever had that poſſeſſion from the Apoſtles daies, they that affirm muſt prove, when we have diſabled their title from the Law.

2. But what muſt we prove? that *all* the Church hath been guiltleſs of the Papal uſurpation, or only *ſome* in every age? of *all* its no more neceſſary to us, then to prove that there have been no Hereſies ſince the Apoſtles. If a piece of the Church may turn Hereticks, or but Schiſmaticks, as the *Novatians*, and *African* Donatiſts, why may not another piece turn Papiſts?

3. What will you ſay to a man that knoweth not a Proteſtant, nor a Papiſt, or believeth only Chriſtianity it ſelf, and meddleth not with the Pope, any further then to ſay, [I believe not in him, Jeſus I know: and

and the Apoſtles, and Scripture, and Chriſtianity I know, but the Pope I know not :] and ſuppoſe he never ſubſcribed to the *Auguſtane*, *Engliſh*, or any ſuch confeſſion, but only to the Scripture, and the Apoſtles, and Nicene, and other ancient Creeds; By what ſhew of Juſtice can you require this man to prove that there hath been no Pope in every age?

4. The foundation of all our controverſie is doctrinal, whether the Papal Soveraignty be Eſſential to the Church? or neceſſary to our memberſhip? we deny it; you affirm it. If it be not Eſſential, it is enough to us, to prove that which is Eſſential, to have been ſucceſſive: we be not bound in order to the proof of our Church it ſelf, to prove the ſucceſſion of every thing that maketh but to its better being.

Yet profeſſing, that we do it not as neceſſary to our main cauſe, we ſhall *ex abundanti* prove the negative, that the Catholike Church hath not alwaies owned the Papal Soveraignty, and ſo that there have been men that were not only Chriſtians, but as we, Chriſtians without Popery, and againſt it: and ſo ſhall both prove our *Theſis*, and overthrow theirs.

Arg. 4. If there have been ſince the

daies of Chriſt, a Chriſtian Church that was not ſubject to the *Roman* Pope, as the Vicar of Chriſt and univerſal Head and Governour of the Church; then the Church of which the Proteſtants are members, hath been viſible both in its being, and its freedom from Popery. But the Antecedent is true: therefore ſo is the conſequent.

I ſhall prove the Antecedent, and therein the viſibility of our Church, and the non-exiſtence in thoſe times of the Papacy.

Arg. 1. My firſt Argument ſhall be from the general Council of *Chalcedon*.

If the priviledges of the *Roman* Sea were given to it by the Biſhops conſequently becauſe of the Empire of that City, and therefore equal priviledges after given to *Conſtantinople* on the ſame account; then had not *Rome* thoſe priviledges from the Apoſtles (and conſequently the whole Catholike Church was without them). But the Antecedent is affirmed by that fourth great approved Council: In *Act.* 16. *Bin. p.* 134. [We everywhere following the definitions of the holy Fathers, and the Canon, and the things that have been now read, of the hundred and fifty Biſhops moſt beloved to God, that were congregate under the Emperour *Theodoſius* the great of pious

pious memory, in the Royal City of *Conſtantinople*, new *Rome*, we alſo knowing them, have defined the ſame things concerning the priviledges of the ſame moſt holy Church of *Conſtantinople*, new *Rome*: For to the ſeat of old *Rome*, becauſe of the Empire of that City, the Fathers conſequently gave the priviledges. And the hundred and fifty Biſhops, moſt beloved of God, being moved with the ſame intention, have given equal priviledges to the moſt holy ſeat of new *Rome*: reaſonably judging, that the City adorned with the Empire and Senate, ſhall enjoy equal priviledges with old Regal *Rome*.]

Here we have the Teſtimony of one of the greateſt general Councils, of the humane original of *Romes* priviledges. *Bellarmine* hath nothing to ſay, but that they ſpoke falſly, and that this clauſe was not confirmed by the Pope (which are fully anſwered by me elſewhere.) But this is nothing to our preſent buſineſs: It is a matter of fact that I uſe their Teſtimony for. And if all the Biſhops in two of the moſt approved general Councils, (called the Repreſentative Catholike Church) were not competent witneſſes in ſuch a caſe, to tell us what was done, and what was not done

in thoſe times, then we have none. The Papiſts can pretend to no higher teſtimony on their part. The Church it ſelf therefore hath here decided the controverſie.

And yet note, that even theſe priviledges of *Rome* were none of his pretended univerſal Government.

Its in vain to talk of the Teſtimonies of particular Doctors, if the moſt renowned general Councils cannot be believed. Yet I will add an Argument from them as conjunct.

Arg. 2. Had the *Roman* univerſal Soveraignty, as eſſential to the Catholike Church, been known in the daies of *Tertullian*, *Cyprian*, *Athanaſius*, *Nazianzen*, *Nyſſen*, *Baſil*, *Optatus*, *Auguſtine*, and the other Doctors that confounded the Hereſies or Schiſms of thoſe times (*e. g.* the *Novatians*, *Donatiſts*, *Arrians*, &c.) the ſaid Doctors would have plainly and frequently inſiſted on it for the conviction of thoſe Hereticks and Schiſmaticks: But this they do not: therefore it was not known in thoſe times.

The conſequence of the Major is evident hence: The Doctors of the Church were men at leaſt of common wit and prudence in the

the matters which they did debate: therefore they would have insisted on this argument, if then it had been known. The reason of the consequence is, because it had been most obvious, easie, and potent to dispatch their controversies. 1. When the *Arrians* and many other Hereticks denied Christs eternal Godhead, had it not been the shortest expeditious course, to have cited them to the barr of the Judge of controversies, the infallible Soveraign Head of the Church; and convinced them that they were to stand to his judgement? 2. Had not this Argument been at hand, to have confounded all Heresies at once, [That which agreeth not with the Belief of the *Roman* Pope and Church is false: But such is your opinion: therefore]

2. So for the Donatists; when they disputed for so many years against the Catholikes, which was the true Church, had it not been *Augustins* shortest, surest way to have argued thus: That only is the true Church that is subject to the Pope of *Rome*, and adhereth to him: But so do not you: therefore.]

Either the *Arrians*, *Donatists* and such others did believe the Papal Soveraignty and Vicarship, or not: If they did, 1. How

is it poſſible they ſhould actually reject both the *Doctrine* and *Communion* of the Pope and Roman Church? 2. And why did not the Fathers rebuke them for ſinning againſt conſcience, and their own profeſſion herein?

But if they did not believe the Papal Soveraignty, then 2. How came it to paſs that the Fathers did labour no more to convince them of that (now ſuppoſed) fundamentall Errour? when 1. It is ſuppoſed as hainous a ſin as many of the reſt. 2. And was the maintainer of the reſt. Had they but firſt demonſtrated to them, that the Pope was their Governour and Judge, and that his Headſhip being eſſentiall to the Church, it muſt needs be of his faith, all Hereſies might have been confuted, the people ſatisfied, and the controverſies diſpatched in a few words.

3. Either Arrians, Donatiſts, Novatians, and ſuch like, were before their defection acquainted with the Roman Soveraignty, or not. If they were not, then it is a ſign it was not commonly then received in the Church, and that there were multitudes of Chriſtians that were no Papiſts: If they were, then why did not the Fathers, 1. Urge them with this as a granted truth, till they had

had renounced it? 2. And then why did they not charge this defection from the Pope upon them, among their hainous crimes? why did they not tell them, that they were subjected to him as soon as they were made Christians; and therefore they should not perfidiously revolt from him? How is it that we find not this point disputed by them on both sides, yea and as copiously as the rest, when it would have ended all?

And for the Minor, that the Fathers have not thus dealt with Hereticks, the whole Books of *Tertullian*, *Nazianzen*, *Nyssen*, *Basil*, *Optatus*, *Hierom*, *Augustine*, and others are open certain witnesses. They use no such Argument, but fill their Books with others; most imprudently and vainly, if they had known of this, and had believed it. Otherwise the Papists would never have been put to gather up a few impertinent scraps to make a shew with.

We see by experience here among us, that this point is Voluminously debated; and if we differ in other matters, the Papists call us to the Roman bar, and bring in this as the principall difference. And why would it not have been so then between the Fathers, and the Donatists, Arrians, and such like, if the Fathers had believed this? Its clear

hence that the Papall Vicarſhip was then unknown to the Church of Chriſt.

Arg. 3. The Tradition witneſſed by the greater part of the Univerſal Church ſaith, that the Papal Vicarſhip or Soveraignty is an innovation and uſurpation, and that the Catholick Church was many hundred years without it: Therefore there was then no ſuch Papal Church.

This is not a ſingle teſtimony, nor of ten thouſand, or ten millions, but of the Major Vote of the whole Church; and in Councils the Major Vote ſtands for the whole. If this witneſs therefore be refuſed, we cannot expect that the words of a few Doctors ſhould be credited; Nor may they expect that we credit any witneſs of theirs, that is not more credible.

And that the Antecedent is true, is known to the world; as we know that the Turks believe in *Mahomet*, by the common conſent of hiſtory and travellers. Part of the Churches anathematize the Romans, and part more modeſtly diſown them, and the generality that ſubject not themſelves do profeſs that Popery is an uſurpation, and that in the ancient Church it was not ſo; and this they have by Tradition from generation to generation. And if the Roman pretended

pretended Tradition be with them of value, the Tradition of the far greater part of the Church is with us to be of more. We muſt deſpair of ſatisfying them with witneſs, if moſt of the Chriſtian world be rejected, and the Tradition of the greateſt part of the Church be taken to be falſe in a matter of publick notorious fact.

Arg. 4. Many Churches without the verge of the Roman Empire, never ſubjected themſelves to *Rome*, (and many not of many hundred years after Chriſt:) therefore there were viſible Chriſtian Churches from the beginning, to this day, that were not for the Roman Vicarſhip.

That abundance of Churches were planted by the Apoſtles, without the reach of the Roman Empire, is plentifully teſtified by the ancients, and the Papiſts commonly confeſs it. That theſe were under the Papal Government, all the Papiſts in the world cannot prove. The contrary is confeſſed by them, and proved by us. 1. They came not ſo much as to Generall Councils. 2. They had no Biſhops ordained by the Pope, or any impowred by him. 3. They never appealed to him. 4. They never had any cauſes judged by him. 5. They performed no obedience to him, nor lived under

der his Laws; nor ſcarce had any communion with him, more then the common communion that is held in Charity, and common faith and ordinances with all. Such were the Indians, the Perſians, the further *Armenia* and *Parthia*, the Habaſſines and many more. And of long time the Engliſh and the Scots, that refuſed ſo much as to eat and drink in the ſame Inn with the Roman Legates: much leſs would obey him, ſo much as in the change of Eaſter day; we challenge them to ſhew us any appearance of ſubjection to the Pope in the generality of the Churches without the Empire.

But you ſay, that the Habaſſines were under the Patriarch of *Alexandria*, and he under the Pope.

Anſ. 1. If that were true, yet whats that to all the reſt? 2. Give us your proof that the Abaſſines were under the Patriarch of *Alexandria*, before that Patriarch broke off his communion with *Rome*. The Canons of *Piſanus*, of yeſterdayes invention, we regard not: Surely the true Canons of *Nice* (*Can.* 6.) meaſure out no more to the Patriarch of *Alexandria*, but *Ægypt*, *Lybia*, and *Pentapolis*. There's no mention of *Ethiopia*: And its not like that the greateſt part of his Province would have

have been left out. 3. If it had been ſo, yet we utterly deny that ever the Pope had the Government of the Alexandrian Patriarch: Only for a little while he had a precedency in honorary Title, and in Councils; as the City of *London* is preferred before *York*, but doth not Govern it at all.

Here therefore (without the Roman Empire) you may ſee thoſe Churches that have ſucceſſively been viſible, and yet no Papiſts. This your *Raynerius* confeſſeth *contr. Waldenſ. Catalog. in Bibliothec. Patr. Tom.* 4. *pag.* 773. ſaying [*Armeniorum Eccleſia, & Æthiopum, & Indorum, & cæteræ quas Apoſtoli converterunt, non ſubſunt Romanæ Eccleſiæ.*] See *Godignus de Rebus Abaſſinorum*, of their Antiquity.

Arg. 5. The Eaſtern Churches within the Empire were never ſubjects of the Pope: therefore there have been and are Churches Viſible, that neither were nor are his ſubjects.

The Antecedent I have proved in my *Key for Catholicks*, from the Council of *Carthage*'s Letters to Pope *Cœleſtine*, after their reſiſtance of *Zoſimus*; and divers teſtimonies from *Baſil* and others. And they can give us themſelves no plauſible appearance of a proof of that ſubjection which they aſſert:

aſſert: no more then the younger Juſtices on the Bench are ſubject to the elder, or the Jury to the foreman, or a Maſter of Arts in a Colledge to a Batchelor in Divinity, or then the Mayor of *Briſtoll* is to the Mayor of *York*.

1. The Pope never choſe the Patriarchs of *Alexandria*, *Antioch*, &c. 2. It did not belong to him to ordain them: nor did he authorize any other to do it, nor did they receive or hold their power from him, 3. They receive no Laws of his to Rule by. 4. They were not commanded or Judged by him. 5. The Patriarch of *Conſtantinople* had equall Priviledges with him. So that here is nothing like to Soveraignty and ſubjection, nor any acknowledgement of an univerſal Vicar of Chriſt. Communion indeed they held with *Rome*, as they did with one another, till pride divided them; but Communion is one thing, and Subjection is another. The Greek Church never gave them this.

Arg. 6. My next Argument to prove the Novelty of their Church as Papal, and conſequently that the Univerſal Church was void of Popery, and therefore of the ſame Religion with Proteſtants, ſhall be from the teſtimony of their own moſt magnified Biſhops. *Gre-*

Gregory 1. *Epiſt. Regiſt. l.* 4. *c.* 80. ſpeaking againſt the Patriarch of *Conſtantinople*, for uſurping the Title of Oecumenicall Patriarch, or Univerſal Biſhop, ſaith (*fol.* 181, 182. *Edit. Pariſ.* 1551.) [*Sicut enim veneranda veſtra ſanctitas novit, mihi per ſanctam* Chalcedonenſem *Synodum Pontificis ſedis Apoſtolicæ, cui Deo diſponente deſervio, hoc Univerſalitatis nomen oblatum eſt: ſed Nullus unquam deceſſorum meorum hoc tam prophano vocabulo uti conſenſit. Quia viz., ſi Unus Patriarcha Univerſalis dicitur, Patriarcharum nomen Cæteris derogatur. Sed abſit hoc, abſit à Chriſtiana mente, id ſibi velle quempiam arripere, unde fratrum ſuorum honorem imminuere ex quantulacunque parte videatur. Cum ergo nos hunc honorem noluimus oblatum ſuſcipere; penſate quam ignominioſum ſit hunc ſibi quempiam violenter uſurpare voluiſſe Propterea ſanctitas veſtra in ſuis Epiſtolis neminem* Univerſalem *nominet, ne ſibi debitum detrahat, cum alteri honorem offert indebitum.*]

1. Here he affirmeth that the Title of *Univerſal* was never uſed by any of his predeceſſors, nor received. 2. That it is a prophane Title. 3. That it is an injury to other Patriarchs. 4. That its unbeſeeming a Chriſtian mind to aſſume it. 5. That its

undue.

undue. 6. He perſwaded the Biſhops of *Alexandria* and *Antioch* to give it to no man whoſoever.

Obj. But he ſaith that the Council of *Chalcedon* offered it him. *Anſ.* 1. If he renounce it as undue and prophane, and ſay that *de facto* none of his predeceſſors took it, this is as much as we deſire. 2. That at the Council of *Chalcedon*, near 150. years before this, two Deacons (that they ſay have no Votes) call'd *Theodorus* and *Iſchirion*, did ſuperſcribe their Libels, to *Leo Univerſal Archbiſhop*, I find; but no more: And this is it that *Gregory* here brags of: And whats two Deacons to the Council?

Obj. But it is only the *Name* and not the *Thing* that he diſclaims, and that is in modeſty. *Anſ.* 1. How then could he cenſure the *name* as *undue*, *injurious*, *prophane*, and *blaſphemous*, if he owned the Thing? ſeeing *aptanda ſunt verba rebus*: words are to be fitted to Things. 2. But I ſhall confute this fully from his following words.

[*Ita ut Univerſa ſibi tentet aſcribere, & omnia quæ ſoli uni capiti cohærent, videlicet Chriſto, per elationem pomputici ſermonis, ejuſdem Chriſti ſibi ſtudeat membra ſubjugare.*]

Here it is plain 1. That it is the *Thing* as well

well as the *Name* that *Gregory* wrote againſt. 2. And that it is alſo a palpable fiction of the Papiſts (for want of a better) that *Gregory* oppoſeth only ſuch an Univerſal Epiſcopacy as taketh away all Epiſcopacy from others. Ridiculous! They would make us believe, that *John* of *Conſtantinople* would have had no Biſhop in the world but himſelf; and that the Council that gave him the Title, intended all to degrade themſelves; and that there were no Biſhops under him ever after; when other Councils confirmed his Title. On the contrary, you here ſee 1. That there is but one Head, even Chriſt. 2. And that *Johns* ſin in arrogating the Title [*Univerſal*] was, that he would ſubjugate, or ſubject all Chriſts Members to himſelf. And is not this now the very form of Popery, which *Gregory* makes ſo great a ſin? even to ſubject all Chriſts Members to one, as an Univerſal Patriarch or Biſhop? Yea much higher Titles do they arrogate, even to be [the Vicar of Chriſt, and God, and in ſtead of Chriſt and God; and to be the Vice-Chriſt.]

He proceeds [*Nec mirum quod ille tentator, qui initium omnis peccati ſcit eſſe ſuperbiam*, &c.] Making the Devil the author of this Title.

He

He adds a weighty reaſon [*ſi enim hoc dici licenter permittitur, honor Patriarcharum omnium negatur. Et cum fortaſſe is in errore periit qui Univerſalis dicitur, nullus jam Epiſcopus remanſiſſe in ſtatu veritatis invenitur*] or as more plainly before *c.* 76. *fol.* 180. in the *Epiſt.* to the Emperour *Maurice* [*ſi igitur illud nomen in ea Eccleſia ſibi quiſquam arripuit, quod apud bonorum omnium judicium fuit: Univerſa ergo Eccleſia, quod abſit, à ſtatu ſuo corruit, quando is qui appellatur Univerſalis cadit*] The reaſon is plain, becauſe the Head of every political ſociety is eſſential to it: and therefore if the Head of the Univerſal Church fall away to Hereſie or Infidelity, the Church falls: as *Bellarmine* knew when he told us, that if the Pope ſhould erre in determining, the Church would be bound to take evil for good, and vice for vertue.

He proceeds in the ſame *Epiſt. ad Maur. Imperat.* [*Sed abſit à Cordibus Chriſtianorum nomen iſtud blaſphemiæ*, &c.] [Far be this name of blaſphemy from the hearts of Chriſtians, *&c.*]

And after again ſaith [*Sed nullus eorum unquam. hoc ſingularitatis vocabulum aſſumpſit, nec uti conſenſit*] That none of the

the *Roman* Biſhops did ever aſſume this name of ſingularity; nor conſent to uſe it.]

And therefore he concludes to the Patriarchs of *Alexandria* and *Antioch*, c. 80. [*Oportet ergo ut conſtanter ac ſine præjudicio ſervetis ſicut accepiſtis Eccleſias, & nihil ſibi in nobis hæc tentatio diabolicæ uſurpationis aſcribat. State fortes, ſtate ſecuri; Scripta cum Univerſalis nominis falſitate, nec dare unquam, nec recipere præſumatis*] He chargeth them never to give or take writing with the falſhood of this name [*Univerſal*] as being from the Devils tentation.

And in *Ep.* 38. *c.* 82. to *John Conſt.* himſelf he calls it [*Nefandum elationis vocabulum*] and the cauſe [*Nefandum & prophanum tumorem*] and after he calls it [the uſurping of a proud and fooliſh word.]

To all this *Bellarmine* miſerably anſwereth *de Pontif. Rom. l.* 2. *c.* 31. that the title [Univerſal] as it ſignifieth a ſole Biſhop to whom all other are but Vicars, is indeed profane, ſacrilegious and Antichriſtian, and is it that *Gregory* ſpeaks againſt, but not as it excludeth not particular Biſhops,] To which I anſwer, 1. To be the *Vicarius* of a Superiour, is not an excluſion. The Pope ſaith he is the Vicar of Chriſt the chief

Paſtour and Biſhop of ſouls: and all Paſtours are to Preach the Word of reconciliation in his name and ſtead, 1 *Cor.* 5. 19. and yet they are not thereby excluded from being Paſtours. If to be Chriſts ſervants, may conſiſt with Epiſcopacy; much more to be his *Vicarii* over their particular flocks. Rather this is too high an honour for us to aſſume. I do not think that all the Clergy under the Pope, do think themſelves honoured ſo much as they ſhould be if they were his Vicars. 2. Hath not that man ſold his conſcience to his cauſe, that will perſwade the world that the Patriarch of *Conſtantinople* was about to unbiſhop all the Biſhops in the world except himſelf? Let any man ſhew us by tolerable proof, that *John* of *Conſtantinople* did claim any higher a power over all others, or would bring other Biſhops by his Univerſality to be lower, then the Pope of *Rome* doth by his Univerſality, and then I will confeſs that Papiſts only have eyes and reaſon, and all the world beſides are blind, and mad, or beaſts. Their cauſe is at a fair paſs, when they muſt fly to ſuch palpable falſhoods, as makes them the wonder of their ſober readers. 3. I proved before from the expreſs words of *Gregory*, that it is Superiority of

of Government, and making all other Bishops subject to him, that he condemned in the Patriarch of *Constantinople*. And no doubt he made not the least of his arrogancy: Nor do I believe that it can be proved that *John*, or the Council that gave him the Title, did ever intend so much as a Universal Government, which the Pope now usurpeth; but only a Primacy before all, which Popes were then striving for. For the Greeks to this day disclaim it, and they never strove to exercise it.

I will give you more of *Gregories* words to put the question past doubt, *Cap.* 82. *Ep.* 38. to *John*, saith [*Humilitatem ergo frater charissime totis visceribus dilige, per quam cunctorum fratrum concordia & sanctæ Universalis Ecclesiæ unitas valeat custodiri: Certe Paulus Apostolus cum audiret quosdam dicere, Ego sum Pauli, ego Apollo, ego vero Cephæ, hanc dilacerationem corporis Dominici, per quam membra ejus aliis quodammodo se capitibus sociabant, vehementissimè perhorrescens exclamavit, dicens: Nunquid Paulus pro vobis crucifixus est: aut in nomine Pauli baptizati estis? Sic ergo ille membra Dominici corporis certis extra Christum quasi capitibus, & ipsis quidem Apostolis subjici particulariter evitavit: Tu quid*

Chriſto Univerſalis ſcilicet Eccleſiæ capiti, in extremi judicii ei dicturus examine, qui cuncta ejus membra tibimet conaris Univerſalis appellatione ſupponere!]

Here you ſee 1. That the unity and concord of the Church is not maintained by univerſal Headſhip, but by fraternal communion and humility. 2. That it wounded *Paul*, and ſhould do us, to ſee the Church make men as it were their heads, though they were Apoſtles, and though *Peter* was one of them: and that *extra Chriſtum*, beſide Chriſt, none, no not *Peter* ſhould be as a Head to Chriſts members. 3. Much more abominable is it for any man to pretend to be the univerſal Biſhop or Head to all Chriſts members: 4. That the ſin of this uſurpation was againſt Chriſt the Churches Head, and that before him in Judgement the uſurper of univerſal Epiſcopacy will be confounded for this very thing. 5. And that the crime of this title of univerſal Biſhop was, that it endeavoured to put all Chriſts members under him that uſed it (*tibimet ſupponere:*) not to exclude all other Biſhops, but to put under him all Chriſts members. Theſe are the words of *Gregory*: and if men can make what their liſt of words ſo full and plain, and

and oft repeated in many Epiſtles, what hope have they that their Judge of Controverſies ſhould do any more to end their Controverſies then Scripture hath done, which they cannot underſtand without ſuch an unintelligible Judge?

He proceeds (*ibid.*) [*Quis ergo in hoc tam perverſo vocabulo, niſi ille ad imitandum proponitur, qui deſpectis Angelorum legionibus, ſecum ſocialiter conſtitutis, ad culmen conatus eſt ſingularitatis erumpere, ut & nulli ſubeſſe, & ſolus omnibus præeſſe videretur.*] He maketh him the imitator of the Devil, that aſpiring above the reſt of the Angels, fell by pride.

But *Bellarmine* hath three Reaſons to prove yet that *Gregory* after all this meant not the univerſal Headſhip or Epiſcopacy indeed. 1. Becauſe the holy Council of *Chalcedon* offered it him. *Anſ.* 1. A fair offer! becauſe two or three Deacons inſcribed their Libels to him with the name of univerſal Archbiſhop: And we muſt believe that the Council approved of this, though we cannot prove it. Or if they called him the *Head*, as the City of *London* is the *Head* City in *England*, and the Earle of *Arundel* the Head Earle, or the Lord Chancelour the Head Judge, that yet have

no Government of the reſt, what advantage were this to the *Roman* Vicarſhip? 2. If *Gregory* judge the name ſo blaſphemous, when it ſignifieth an univerſal Governour of the Church, ſurely he believed that the Council offered it not to him in that ſence, but as he was the *Epiſcopus primæ ſedis*. 3. But again, I ſay the matter of fact is it that I am enquiring of: And I have the teſtimony of this *Roman* Biſhop that none of his Predeceſſors would receive that name.

2. But ſaith *Bellarmine*, he ſaith that the care of the whole Church was committed to *Peter*, which is all one.] *Anſ.* 1. But ſo it was committed alſo to the reſt of the Apoſtles: *Paul* had on him the care of all the Churches, that claimed no Headſhip. 2. He expreſly excludeth *Peters* Headſhip, both in the words before recited, and after, ſaying [*Certe Petrus Apoſtolus primum membrum* (or rather as Dr. *James* Corrupt. of the Fathers *Part.* 2. *p.* 60 ſaith he found it in ſeven written Copies, [*Apoſtolorum primus membrum*] *Sanctæ & Univerſalis Eccleſiæ eſt: Paulus, Andreas, Johannes, quid aliud quam ſingularium ſunt plebium capita? Et tamen ſub uno capite omnes membra ſunt Eccleſiæ*] that is [*Peter* the firſt of

of the Apoſtles, is a member of the holy and univerſal Church : *Paul*, *Andrew*, *John*, what are they but the Heads of the ſingular flocks of the people ? And yet all are members of the Church under one Head] (that is, Chriſt) ſo that Chriſt is the only Head : *Peter* is but a member, as the other Apoſtles are ; but not a Head.

3. But ſaith *Bellarmine*, *Gregory* could not but know that the title of *Epiſcopus Univerſalis Eccleſiæ*, which is all one, had been oft aſſumed by the Popes.] *Anſ.* 1. Whether was *Bellarmine* or *Gregory* the wiſer man? at leaſt the fitter interpreter of thoſe words: would *Gregory* have made them ſo blaſphemous, fooliſh, prophane, and deviliſh, if he had thought them of the ſame importance with thoſe which his Predeceſſors uſed ? Or was he ſo ſilly as not to know that this might have been retorted on him ? What a ſilly ſot, what a wicked diſſembling hypocrite, doth *Bellarmine* feign Pope *Gregory* to have been ? 2. But verily did the Learned Jeſuite believe himſelf that [*Univerſalis Epiſcopus Eccleſiæ*] *& Epiſcopus Eccleſiæ Univerſalis*] are of the ſame ſignification ? Every Biſhop in the world, that adhered to the common Communion of Chriſtians

and was a Catholike, was wont to be called [a Biſhop of the Catholike Church,] and is indeed ſuch; but he is not therefore [the univerſal Biſhop of the Church.]

But *Bellarmine* will not charge *Gregory* of ſuch horrid diſſimulation without reaſon. His firſt reaſon is, [that *Gregory* did it for caution, to prevent abuſe.] *Anſ.* What! charge it with blaſphemy, prophaneſs, deviliſm, wronging all the Church, and alſo to excommunicate men for it, and all this to prevent abuſe, when he held it lawful! Did hell ever hatch worſe hypocriſie then this that he fathers on his holieſt Pope?

But 2. His other reaſon is worſe then this; forſooth [becauſe the queſtion was only whether *John* of *Conſtantinople* ſhould have this title, and not whether the Biſhop of *Rome* ſhould have it: and therefore *Gregory* ſimply and abſolutely pronounceth the name ſacrilegious and prophane, that is, as given to *John*, (but not to himſelf) yet he refuſed it himſelf, though due to him, that he might the better repreſs the pride of the Biſhop of *Conſtantinople*.] *Anſ.* The ſum is then, that *Gregory* did meerly lye and diſſemble for his own end. He labours to prove that blaſphemous, ſacrilegious, *&c.* which

which he desired; But we will not judge so odiously of the Pope as Papists do. Doth he charge the other Patriarchs and Bishops to give it no man? doth he blame them after in other Epistles that gave him that Title? and doth he profess that never any of his Predecessors received it, and make so hainous a matter of it, and yet all this while approve it as for himself? Who will believe a Saint to be so diabolical, that calls it an imitation of the Devil? You see now what the Roman Cause is come to, and whether their Church as Papal, that is, their Universal Sovereignty, be not sprung up since *Gregories* dayes.

Hear him a little further (*ibid.*) [*Atque ut cuncta breviter cingulo locutionis adstringam: sancti ante Legem, sancti sub Lege, sancti sub Gratia, omnes hi perficientes Corpus Domini in membris sunt Ecclesiæ constituti, & nemo se unquam Universalem vocare voluit: Vestra autem sanctitas agnoscat quantum apud se tumeat, quæ illo nomine vocari appetit, quo vocari nullus præsumpsit, qui veraciter sanctus fuit.*] That is, [And to bind up all in the girdle of speech, the Saints before the Law, the Saints under the Law, the Saints under Grace, all these making up the Body of Christ, were placed among the Members

Members of the Church, yet never man would be called Univerſal. Let your Holineſs therefore conſider how with your ſelf you ſwell, that deſire to be called by that name, by which no man hath preſumed to be called that was truly Holy.]

Well! if this be not as plain as Proteſtants ſpeak againſt Popery, I will never hope to underſtand a Pope

I only add, that *Gregory* makes this uſurpation of the name of an Univerſal Biſhop a forerunner of Antichriſt: And that Pope *Pelagius* condemned it before him; which *Gratian* puts into their Decrees, or Canon Law.

And that he took the Churches authority to be greater then his own, when he tells *John*, [*Sed quoad in meâ correptione deſpicior, reſtat ut Eccleſiam debeam adhibere.*]

Lib. 7. Ep. 30. *Dixi nec mihi vos, nec cuiquam alteri tale aliquid ſcribere debere: & ecce in præfatione epiſtolæ quam ad meipſum qui prohibui direxiſtis, ſuperbæ appellationis verbum*, Univerſalem me Papam *dicentes, imprimere curaſtis. Quod peto dulciſſima ſanctitas veſtra, ultra non faciat: quia vobis ſubtrahitur, quod alteri pluſquam ratio exigit, præbetur.* | See then whether it be not judged by him undue to himſelf as well as to others. And

And what the weight of the matter ſeemed to him, judge more by theſe words, Ep. 83. l. 4. ad Arrian. *In iſto ſceleſto vocabulo conſentire, nihil eſt aliud quam fidem perdere.*] [To conſent in that wicked word, is nothing elſe but to loſe (or deſtroy) the faith.] That is, apoſtaſie.

And l. 6. c. 194. Mauric. Aug. *Ego fidenter dico, quia quiſquis ſe univerſalem ſacerdotem vocat, vel vocare deſiderat, in elatione ſua Antichriſtum præcurrit; quia ſuperbiendo ſe cæteris præponit, nec diſpari ſuperbia ad errorem ducitur.*]

Arg. 7. The Papiſts themſelves confeſs, that multitudes of Chriſtians, if not moſt by far, have been the oppoſers of the Pope, or none of his ſubjects: therefore by their Teſtimony there have been viſible Churches of ſuch.

Æneas Sylvius, after Pope *Pius* 2. ſaith, ſmall regard was had to the Church of *Rome* before the Council of *Nice*. *Bellarmine* ſaith, This is partly true, by reaſon of the perſecution of thoſe ages, and partly falſe. *Anſ.* But, if true, we prove the matter of fact, and leave *Bellarmine* better to prove his Reaſon. If it be falſe, then their own Hiſtorians are not to be believed, though worthy to be Popes. And then what hiſtoricall teſtimony will they believe? Vo-

Voluminouſly do their Hiſtorians mention the Oppoſition of the Greeks on one ſide, and of the Emperours and Kings, and Divines, that were under the Popes Patriarchal power; as *Mich. Goldaſtus* in abundance of Treatiſes hath manifeſted.

I gave before the teſtimony of *Reynerius*, that the Churches planted by the Apoſtles, were not under the Pope.

I ſhall once more recite the words of *Melch. Canus*, *Loc. Theol. lib. 6. cap. 7. fol.* 201. [Not only the Greeks, but almoſt all (N. B.) the reſt of the Biſhops of the whole world, have vehemently fought to deſtroy the Priviledge of the Church of *Rome*: and indeed they had on their ſide, both the Arms of Emperours, and the greater Number of Churches; and yet they could never prevail to abrogate the Power of the One Pope of *Rome*.] By the Papiſts confeſſion then moſt of the Churches, and almoſt all the Biſhops of the whole world, and the Emperours & their Armies, have vehemently fought to abrogate the Popes power, and deſtroy the Priviledges of *Rome*.

Reynerius his teſtimony concerning the Antiquity of the Waldenſes, as from Pope *Sylveſters* dayes, if not the Apoſtles, hath been oft cited: Had they been but from

Gregories

Gregories dayes, it had been enough, when we have his own Teſtimony, that no Biſhop of *Rome* would own (to that time) that wicked, prophane, ſacrilegious, fooliſh, blaſphemous, dividing name of *Univerſal* Patriarch or Biſhop, which who ever holds to, deſtroys the faith.

Arg. 8. The next Argument ſhould have been from the Hiſtorical Teſtimony of the Ancients, that the Papal Soveraignty was then no part of the Churches faith, nor owned by them. But here to produce the Teſtimonies of all ages, would be to write a Volume in Folio, on this one Argument alone: For how can the Hiſtory of all Ages be ſo particularly delivered out of ſuch a Multitude of Books, but in a multitude of words?

And it is done already ſo fully, that I provoke the Papiſts to anſwer the Catalogues and hiſtoricall Evidence given in, if they can. If you ask where, I will now only tell you of, 1. *Blondell* againſt *Perron de Primatu in Eccleſia* (in French) that ſhews you the torrent of Antiquity againſt the Papal Soveraignty. 2. *Molinæus* (in French) *de Novitate Papiſmi* againſt the ſame *Perron*. 3. Biſhop *Uſher, de ſtatu & ſucceſſione Eccleſiarum*, and his Anſwer to the Jeſuites challenge.

challenge. 4. Dr. *Field* of the Church, who *lib.* 5. anſwereth *Bellarmines* allegations from all ſort of Antiquity, which are their ſtrength. I paſs by many others, ſome of which I have named in the foreſaid 3. Diſpute of the *ſafe Religion:* where alſo I have produced more of this evidence then they can anſwer. At leaſt much more then you have returned me in your laſt Paper for the contrary, to which I deſire your anſwer: For its in vain to write one thing ſo oft.

I ſhall only inſtance in the currant Teſtimony of their own Hiſtorians, of the Beginning of their Univerſal Headſhip. Saith *Regino Chron. l.* 1. *An.* 808. *p.* 13. [*Bonifacius obtinuit apud Phocam Principem, ut ſedes Romana Caput eſſet omnium Eccleſiarum: quia Eccleſia Conſtantinopolitana primum ſe omnium Eccleſiarum ſcribebat.*]

Hermannus Contractus, An. M. 4550. p. 122. [*Hoc tempore Phocas Romanam Eccleſiam omnium Eccleſiarum Caput eſſe conſtituit: Nam Conſtantinop. primam ſe eſſe ſcripſit.*]

So Marianus Scotus in Phoc. [*Bonifacius P.* 67. *impetravit à Phoca Cæſare ut ſedes Apoſtolica Romana Caput eſſet Eccleſiæ, quum antea Conſtantinopolis Primam omnium ſe ſcriberet.*] The ſame hath *Sigebertus Gemblac.*

blac. An. 607. *p.* 526. And ſo *Compilat. Chron.* and many more.

Beneventus de Rambaldis Lib. Auguſtali, ſaith p. 8. *in Phoca* [*Phocas occiſor Mauritii——qui Primus conſtituit, Quod Eccleſia eſſet Caput omnium Eccleſiarum: Cùm prius Conſtantin. ſupremum ſe nominaret.*] Mark here the [*Primus Conſtituit.*] So *Beda, P. Diaconus, Anaſtaſius, Pomponius Lætus*, &c.

And of the Novelty of their worſhip, ſaith *Platina in Gregor.* 1. [What ſhould I ſay more of this holy man! whoſe whole inſtitution of the Church office, ſpecially the old one, was invented and approved by him? which Order I would we did follow: then Learned men would not at this day abhor the reading of the Office ———] So that here is all invented new by *Gregory* (which was hardly received in *Spain*) and yet that changed ſince.

Arg. 9. If the Generality of Chriſtians in the firſt ages, and many (if not moſt) in the later ages, have been free from the Eſſentials of the Papiſts faith, then their faith hath had no ſucceſſive Viſible Church profeſſing it in all ages; but the Chriſtians that are againſt it have been Viſible: But the Antecedent is true: as I prove in ſome inſtances.

1. It

1. It is an Article of their faith determined in a General Council at *Laterane* and *Florence*, that the Pope is above a Council: But that this hath not been ſucceſſively received, the Council of *Baſil* and *Conſtance* witneſs, making it a new Hereſie.

2. It is an Article of their faith, that a Generall Council is above the Pope: for it is ſo determined at *Baſil* and *Conſtance*: But that this hath had no ſucceſſive duration, the Council of *Laterane* and *Florence* witneſs.

3. It is an Article of their faith, that the Pope may depoſe Princes for denying Tranſubſtantiation and ſuch like Hereſies, and alſo ſuch as will not exterminate ſuch Hereticks from their dominions, and may give their dominions to others, and diſcharge their Subjects from their oaths and fidelity: For it is determined ſo in a Council at *Laterane*: But this hath not been ſo from the beginning, not when the 13. Chapter to the Romans was written: Not till the dayes of *Conſtantine*: Not till the dayes of *Gregory* that ſpake in contrary language to Princes: And *Goldaſtus* his three Volumes of Antiquities ſhew you, that there hath been many Churches ſtill againſt it.

4. It is an Article of their faith, that the Body

Body and Blood, together with the Soul and Divinity of our Lord Jesus Christ, is truly, really, and substantially in the Eucharist, and that there is a Change made of the whole substance of Bread into the body, and of the whole substance of Wine into the blood, which they call Transubstantiation.] So the Council of *Trent*: But the Catholick Church hath been of a contrary judgement from age to age, as among many others, *Edm. Albertinus de Eucharist.* hath plainly evinced (though a quarreller hath denyed it and little more) : And its proved, in that successively they judged sense (and Reason by it) a competent discerner of Bread and Wine.

5. It is now *de fide* that the true Sacrament is rightly taken under one kind (without the cup) as the Councils of *Constance* and *Trent* shew. But the Catholick Church hath practised, and the Apostles and the Church taught otherwise, as the Council of *Constance*, and their Writers ordinarily confess.

6. It is an Article of their faith (as appears in the *Trent* Oath) that we must never take and interpret Scripture, but according to the unanimous consent of the Fathers] : But the Catholick

Church before theſe Fathers could not be of that mind: and the Fathers themſelves are of a contrary mind: and ſo are many learned Papiſts.

7. It is an Article of their faith, that there is a Purgatory, and that the ſouls there detained are holpen by the ſuffrages of the faithful. But the latter was ſtrange to all the old Catholick Church (as Biſhop *Uſher* and others have proved) and the very being of Purgatory, was but a new, doubtfull, indifferent opinion of ſome very few men, about *Auguſtines* time.

8. It is now an Article of their faith, that [the holy Catholick Church of *Rome* is the mother and miſtris of all Churches.] But I have ſhewed here and elſewhere, that the Catholick Church judged otherwiſe, and ſo doth for the moſt part to this day.

9. It is now an Article of their faith, that their Traditions are to be received with equall pious affection and reverence as the holy Scripture. But the Catholick Church did never ſo believe.

10. The Council of *Baſil* made it *de fide*, that the Virgin *Mary* was conceived without Originall ſin: But the Catholick Church never judged ſo.

11. Its determined by a Council now, that the

the people may not read the Scripture in a known tongue without the Popes Licenſe: But the Catholick Church never ſo thought, as I have proved, *Diſp.* 3. of the *ſafe Religion.*

12. The Books of *Maccabees* and others are now taken into the Canon of faith, which the Catholick Church received not as ſuch: as Dr. *Coſin*, and Dr. *Reignolds* have fully proved.

To this I might add the Novelty of their Worſhip and Diſcipline; but it would be too tedious: and I have ſaid enough of theſe in other writings. See Dr. *Challoner*, *pag.* 88, 89.

In 16. points Dr. *Challoner* proveth your Novelty from your Confeſſions. Indeed his Book *de Eccleſ. Cath.* though ſmall, is a full anſwer to your main Queſtion.

Arg. 10. If Multitudes (yea the far greateſt part) of Chriſtians in all ages have been ignorant of Popery, but not of Chriſtianity; then hath there been a ſucceſſion of Viſible Profeſſors of Chriſtianity that were no Papiſts: but the antecedent is true: therefore ſo is the conſequent.

In this age it is an apparent thing, that the far greateſt part are ignorant of formal Popery. 1. They confeſs themſelves that the common people, and moſt of the nobi-

lity of *Habaſſia*, *Armenia*, *Greece*, *Ruſſia*, and moſt other Eaſtern Churches that are not Papiſts, are ignorant of the Controverſie. 2. They uſe to tell us here among Proteſtants, that there is not one of many that know what a Papiſt is. 3. We know that of thoſe that go under the name of Papiſts, there is not one of a multitude knoweth. We hear it from the mouths of thoſe we ſpeak with: I have not met with one of ten of the poorer ſort of them, even here among us, that knoweth what a Papiſt or Popery is; but they are taught to follow their Prieſts, and to ſay that theirs is the true Church and old Religion, and to uſe their Ceremonious worſhip, and to forbear coming to our Churches, *&c.* and this is their Religion. And in *Ireland* they are yet far more ignorant: And its well known to be ſo in other parts: Their Prieſts they know, and the Pope they hear of, as ſome perſon of eminent Power in the Church: But whether he be the Univerſal Vicar of Chriſt, and be over all others as well as them, & whether this be of Gods inſtitution, or by the grant of Emperours or Councils, *&c.* they know not. And no wonder, when the Papiſts think that the Council of *Chalcedon* ſpoke falſly of the humane Originall of the

the Primacy in the Imperiall territories: And when the Councils of *Basil* and *Constance* knew not whether Pope or Council was the Head.

And that the people were as ignorant and much more in former ages, they testifie themselves; And before *Gregories* dayes they must needs be ignorant of that which was not then risen in the world.

Yea Dr. *Field* hath largely proved, *Append. lib.* 3. that even the many particular points in which the Papists now differ from us, were but the opinions of a faction among them before *Luther*: and that the Western Church before *Luther* was Protestant, even in those particular Controversies; though this is a thing that we need not prove. And as Dr. *Potter* tells them, *pag.* 68. [The Roman Doctors do not fully and absolutely agree in any one point among themselves, but only in such points wherein they agree with us: In the other disputed between us, they differ one from another as much almost as they differ from us.] He appeals for this to *Bellarmines* Tomes. Though I cannot undertake to make this good in every point, yet that proper Popery was held but by a Faction in the Western Church, even at its

height before *Luther*, is eaſily made good.

He that readeth but the Writers before *Luther*, and in Hiſtory noteth the deſires of Emperours, Kings, and Univerſities, and Biſhops, for Reformation of the things that we have reformed, may ſoon ſee this to be very true. It was *Avitas Leges & conſuetudines Angliæ* (as *Rog. Hoveden* and *Matth. Paris* in *H.* 2. ſhew) that the Pope here damned, and anathematized all that favoured and obſerved them (O tender Father, even to Kings! O enemy of Novelties!) The German Hiſtory collected by *Reuberus*, *Piſtorus*, *Freherus* and *Goldaſtus*, ſhews it as plain as day light, that a Papal Faction by fury and turbulency, kept under the far greater part of the Church by force, that indeed diſſented from them, even from *Hildebrands* dayes till *Luthers*, or near. Saith the *Apologia Henrici* 4. *Imperat. in M. Freheri Tom.* 1. *p.* 178. [Behold Pope *Hildebrands* Biſhops, when doubtleſs they are murderers of Souls and bodies—ſuch as deſervedly are called the Synagogue of Satan—yet they write, that on his and on their ſide (or party) is the holy Mother Church: When the Catholick, that is, the Univerſal Church, is not in the Schiſm of any ſide, (or parties) but in the Univerſa-

lity

lity of the faithfull agreeing together by the ſpirit of Peace and Charity.]

And *p.* 179. [See how this Miniſter of the Devil is beſide himſelf, and would draw us with him into the ditch of perdition? that writeth that Gods holy Prieſthood is with only 13. or few more Biſhops of *Hildebrands*: and that the Prieſthood of all the reſt through the world are ſeparated from the Church of God: when certainly, not only the teſtimony of *Gregory* and *Innocent*, but the judgement of all the holy Fathers agree with that of *Cyprian* —— that he is an Alien, prophane, an enemy; that he cannot have God for his Father, that holdeth not the Unity of the Church: which he after deſcribeth to have one Prieſthood.] *Et p.* 181. [But ſome that go out from us ſay and write, that they defend the party of their *Gregory*: not the Whole, which is Chriſts, which is the Catholick Church of Chriſt.] And *p.* 180. [But our Adverſaries (that went from us, not we from them) uſe thus to commend themſelves--- We are the Catholicks, we are in the Unity of the Church.] So the Writer calls them Catholicks, and us that hold the faith of the holy Fathers, that conſent with all good men, that love peace and brotherhood,----us he

calls Schiſmaticks and Hereticks, and Excommunicate, becauſe we reſiſt not the King---] And *p.* 181. [*Iſidore* ſaith, *Etym. l.* 8. The Church is called Catholick, becauſe it is not as the conventicles of Hereticks, confined in certain countries, but diffuſed through the whole world: therefore they have not the Catholick faith that are in a part, and not in the Whole which Chriſt hath redeemed, and muſt reign with Chriſt.] They that confeſs in the Creed, that they believe the holy Catholick Church, and being divided into parties hold not the Unity of the Church: which Unity, believers being of one heart and one ſoul, properly belongs to the Catholick Church.] So this *Apol.*

One Objection I muſt here remove, which is *all* and *nothing*: *viz.* That the Armenians, Greeks, Georgians, Abaſſines, and many others here named, differ from Proteſtants in many points of faith; and therefore they cannot be of the ſame Church.

Anſ. 1. They differ in nothing Eſſentiall to our Church or Religion, nor near the Eſſence. 2. Proteſtants differ in ſome leſſer points, and yet you call them all Proteſtants your ſelves. 3. I prove undeniably from your own pens, that men differing in matters

ters of faith, are all taken to be of your Church, and ſo of one Church, (and therefore you contradict your ſelves in making all points of faith to be Eſſentials of the Chriſtian Religion or Church.)

1. The Council of *Baſil* and *Conſtance* differed *de fide* with the Pope and the Council of *Laterane* and *Florence*: They expreſly affirm their doctrine to be *de fide*, that the Council is above the Pope, and may depoſe him, *&c.* and the contrary Hereſie. And *Pighius* (*Hierarch. Eccleſ. lib.* 6.) ſaith, that theſe Councils went [againſt the undoubted faith and judgement of the Orthodox Church it ſelf.]

2. Their Saint *Tho. Aquinas*, and moſt of their Doctors with him, differ from the ſecond Council of *Nice*, in holding the Croſs and Image of Chriſt to be worſhipped with *Latria*, which that Council determined againſt.

See more Arguments in my *Key for Cath. p.* 127, 128. and after.

I will now add a Teſtimony ſufficient to ſilence Papiſts in this point: and that is, The Determination of the Theological faculty of *Paris* under their great Seal, againſt one *Johan. de Monteſono ordinis Prædic.* as you may find it after the reſt of the Errors rejected

rejected by that Univerſity, in the end of *Lombard*, printed at *Paris* 1557. *pag.* 426. Their 3. Concluſion is, that [Saint *Thom. Aquin.* doctrine is not ſo approved by the Church, as that we muſt believe that it is in no part of it erroneous *de fide* (in matter of faith) or hereticall. They prove it, becauſe it hath many contradictions, even in matter of faith; and therefore they ought not to believe it not hereticall. Here *fol.* 426, 427. they give ſix examples of his contradictions: and therefore they conclude, that though he were no Heretick (becauſe not pertinacious) yet they ought not to believe that his doctrine was in no part hereticall, or erroneous in the faith. They further argue thus [If we muſt believe his doctrine not hereticall, *&c.* this ſhould be chiefly, becauſe it is approved by the Church. But there is ſome doctrine much more approved by the Church then the doctrine of S. *Tho.* which yet is in ſome part of it hereticall or erroneous in the faith: therefore—— The Minor they prove by many examples. The firſt is of *Peters* doctrine, *Gal.* 2. (I own not this by citing it:) The ſecond is of *Cyprian.* The third of *Hierom*; and they add, that the ſame may be ſaid of *Auguſtine*, and many more approved Doctors.

The

The fourth example is *Lombard* himſelf, who they ſay hath ſomewhat erroneous in the faith. The fifth is *Gratian*, who had he pertinaciouſly adhered to his doctrine, they ſay, had been a manifeſt Heretick: And (ſay they) ſome ſay the like of the Ordinary Gloſſes of the Bible, which yet ſeem of greater authority then *Aquinas*. The ſixth example is of ſome not Canonized Saints, as *Anſelm. Cantuar. Hugo de Sancto Victore*, and others, as authentick as S. *Thomas*.] [And (ſay they) his Canonization, hindereth not, which ſome pretend as of great colour---To ſay that S. *Tho.* in ſome part of his doctrine erred in faith, derogates not from his Canonization, nor from the approbation of his Theologicall doctrine: even as to ſay this of other Saints and chief Doctors derogateth not from their Canonization or approbation. For as the Church by Canonizing one a Saint, doth not thereby approve all his Deeds, ſo in approving his doctrine, it doth not hereby approve all his ſayings or writings, but only that which is not retracted by himſelf, or corrected by another, or deſervedly to be corrected as contrary to truth.

And now when Fathers, even the chief, and your Saints and higheſt Doctors have this

this Teſtimony from the famous Univerſity of *Paris*, to have ſomewhat hereticall or erroneous in the faith (and ſo who among you is free?) I leave it to modeſty to judge, whether the Greeks, Armenians, &c. and we, are not of one Faith, Religion, and Catholick Church, for all our differences in ſome points! Have you had all theſe Nations man by man before your bar, and convinced them of pertinaciouſneſs in hereſie? If not, call them not Hereticks till you are willing to be called ſuch your ſelves, and that by your ſelves.

And thus I have evinced, 1. That the Church of which the Proteſtants are Members, hath been Viſible ſince the dayes of Chriſt on earth. 2. And *ex abundanti*, that the Papal Church as Papal hath not been viſible, and that Chriſtian Churches without Papal Soveraignty have been Viſible ſince *Gregories* dayes, and the whole Catholick Church was ſuch before. And you ſee both in the Eſſentialls, and in the freedom from the Romiſh Vice-Chriſt, where our Church hath been before *Luther*, even ſince Chriſt.

Sir, I have performed this task on this ſuppoſed condition, that you will now do the

the like as to your own Church; and ſend me in ſolid Arguments your proof of this Theſis.

[*The Church of which the Subjects of the Pope are Members, hath been Viſible ever ſince the dayes of Chriſt on earth.*]

Where note, that it is not the Viſibility of your Church as Chriſtian, United in Chriſt the Head, that is in Queſtion: We grant, as Chriſtians, all of you are of the true Chriſtian Church that deſtroy not your Chriſtianity: But it is your new Church form, as Papal, that we queſtion, and renounce. Proteſtants are of no Church but the Chriſtian united in Chriſt: The name Proteſtant ſignifieth not any eſſentiall of their Church, but their Rejection of your Church as Headed by the Pope: You are therefore to prove that your Catholick Church as Headed by the Pope hath been viſible in all ages.

And here I muſt in Juſtice expect, that you give us ſuch a Definition as you will ſtand to through the diſpute, 1. Of [the Church] 2. Of [the Pope] and 3. [Of the Subjects of the Pope] or [Papiſts.] The term [Roman Catholicks] would but divert and elude: For it is not as [Romane] that we oppoſe you, that is, as inhabitants of

of *Rome*, or as ſubject to him as a Biſhop of *Rome*: Nor is it as [Catholicks] that is, as of the Univerſal Chriſtian Church: but as [Papiſts] that is, [ſubjects of the Pope as univerſal Soveraign, or Biſhop.] To diſpute of terms not agreed on, is loſt labour: Define firſt, or you do nothing. I find of your Writers, ſome by the [Church] mean [the Pope] as *Gretſer Defenſ. cap.* 10. *lib.* 3. *de Verbo Dei, pag.* 1450, 1451. [By the Church (ſaith he) we mean the Pope of *Rome*] and [*per Eccleſiam Papam interpretantur: Non abnuo.*] Some by [the Church] mean [a Council] and what they mean by [a Council] I know not well. And ſome mean [the Roman Clergy] *i. e.* of that Dioceſs: And ſome mean [all the Clergy under the Pope:] And ſome mean [all the people that are his ſubjects.] I have given you the Reaſon of my doubting of your meaning in theſe terms, in a Book come out of the Preſs ſince your laſt to me, where I have anſwered moſt of yours.

2. Let me deſire of you ſuch proofs as in your own judgement are cogent. I ſuppoſe (as I have there told you, *Key pag.* 41. *cap.* 12.) that none of you will take either Senſe, Reaſon, Scripture, the Tradition or judgement of moſt of the Church for a ſufficient

ſufficient proof: but yet we will accept of them, when you argue but *ad hominem*: for we renounce them not. I think what ever you ſay, that is not the Determination of the Pope or a Council by him approved (which is all one) you will give us leave to judge that you are uncertain your ſelves whether you ſay true in it, if *de fide*. Saith *Skul. Revius Apol. pro Bellarm. c. 6. p. 255.* The Popes Power is as the hinge, the foundation, and (that I may comprehend all in a word) the ſumm of the Chriſtian faith.

Greg. Valent. Anal. fid. l. 8. c. 7. [The Authority that reſideth in the Pope alone, is called the Authoriy of the Church and Councils.

[*Bellar. de Rom. Pont. l. 4. c. 3.* [It is apparent that the whole firmneſs (or ſtrength) of Councils is from the Pope; not partly of the Pope, and partly of the Council.] *Binnius Vol. 2. p. 515.* ſaith [Every Council hath juſt ſo much ſtrength and authority, as the Apoſtolike ſeat beſtoweth on it.] But I leave you to give us your own judgement.

Your Teſtimonies from Fathers can ſeem of no great weight to us, while you ſo ſlight them your ſelves as commonly you do: with what lies, or Errors, or other incompe-

competency, you charge *Juſtin Mart. Irenaus, Tertullian, Origen, Victorinus, Cyprian, Euſebius, Epiphanius, Prudentius, Hierom, Lactantius, Auguſtine, Procopius, Theodoret, Iſidore, Euthymius, Sozomen, Oecumenius, Bernard*, and all the Fathers, ſee Dr. *James Corrupt. of Fath. Part.* 4. *p.* 2,3. Tell us therefore how far you credit them.

Sir if you refuſe thus firſt to explain your terms, and then prove the Viſibility of your Church, as Papal, ſucceſſively, as I have proved the Viſibility of the Church that I am of, I ſhall be forced to conclude, that you love not the light, but at once give up your cauſe, and the reputation of your impartial Love of truth.

Addenda Miſcellanea.

Concil. Epheſ. 1. *in Epiſtola ad Neſtor. Tom.* 1 *fol.* 315. *ed. Pet. Crab.* [*Petrus & Johannes æqualis ſunt ad alterutrum dignitatis.*]

Comment. in epiſt. Synodal. Baſil. p. 31. *& p.* 40. *Impreſſ. Colon.* 1613. ſaith that [The Provinces ſubject to the four great Patriarchs from the beginning of the Chriſtian

ſtian Church, did know no other ſupream but their own Patriarcks—— And if the Pope be a Patriarck, it is by the Church; If he be Head of all Churches, it is by the Church. And whereas we have ſaid that it is expreſſed in the Council of *Nice*, that many Princes were ſubjected to the Church of *Rome* by Eccleſiaſtical cuſtom, and no other right; the Synod ſhould do the greateſt injury to the Biſhop of *Rome*, if it ſhould attribute thoſe things to him only from cuſtom, which were his due by Divine Right.] This Citation I take from Biſhop *Bromhall*, having not ſeen the Book my ſelf.

The Popiſh Biſhop of *Calcedon*, Survey *cap.* 5. [To us it ſufficeth that the Biſhop of *Rome* is Saint *Peters* ſucceſſour, and this all the Fathers teſtifie, and all the Catholick Church believeth: but whether it be *jure divino*, or *humano*, is no point of Faith.] An ingenuous Confeſſion deſtroying Popery.

See *Aubert Miraus notitia Epiſcopat.* where in the antient *Notit.* and *Leunclavius* record of *Leo Philoſ. Impera.* There are none of the Abaſſine, or other extraimperial Nations under the old Patriarcks. *Caſſander Epiſt.* 37. *D. Ximenio* (*operum p.* 1132.) ſaith of that learned pious Bi-

competency, you charge *Juſtin Mart. Irenæus, Tertullian, Origen, Victorinus, Cyprian, Euſebius, Epiphanius, Prudentius, Hierom, Lactantius, Auguſtine, Procopius, Theodoret, Iſidore, Euthymius, Sozomen, Oecumenius, Bernard*, and all the Fathers, ſee Dr. *James Corrupt. of Fath. Part.* 4. *p.* 2,3. Tell us therefore how far you credit them.

Sir if you refuſe thus firſt to explain your terms, and then prove the Viſibility of your Church, as Papal, ſucceſſively, as I have proved the Viſibility of the Church that I am of, I ſhall be forced to conclude, that you love not the light, but at once give up your cauſe, and the reputation of your impartial Love of truth.

Addenda Miſcellanea.

Concil. Epheſ. 1. *in Epiſtola ad Neſtor. Tom.* 1 *fol.* 315. *ed. Pet. Crab.* [*Petrus & Johannes æqualis ſunt ad alterutrum dignitatis.*]

Comment. in epiſt. Synodal. Baſil. p. 31. *& p.* 40. *Impreſſ. Colon.* 1613. ſaith that [The Provinces ſubject to the four great Patriarchs from the beginning of the Chriſtian

ſtian Church, did know no other ſupream but their own Patriarcks—— And if the Pope be a Patriarck, it is by the Church; If he be Head of all Churches, it is by the Church. And whereas we have ſaid that it is expreſſed in the Council of *Nice*, that many Princes were ſubjected to the Church of *Rome* by Eccleſiaſtical cuſtom, and no other right; the Synod ſhould do the greateſt injury to the Biſhop of *Rome*, if it ſhould attribute thoſe things to him only from cuſtom, which were his due by Divine Right.] This Citation I take from Biſhop *Bromhall*, having not ſeen the Book my ſelf.

The Popiſh Biſhop of *Calcedon*, Survey *cap.* 5. [To us it ſufficeth that the Biſhop of *Rome* is Saint *Peters* ſucceſſour; and this all the Fathers teſtifie, and all the Catholick Church believeth: but whether it be *jure divino*, or *humano*, is no point of Faith.] An ingenuous Confeſſion deſtroying Popery.

See *Aubert Miraus notitia Epiſcopat.* where in the antient *Notit.* and *Leunclavius* record of *Leo Philoſ. Impera.* There are none of the Abaſſine, or other extraimperial Nations under the old Patriarcks. *Caſſander Epiſt.* 37. *D. Ximenio* (*operum p.* 1132.) ſaith of that learned pious Biſhop

ſhop of *Valentia Monlucius*, (ſo highly commended by *Thuanus* and other learned men) that he ſaid, *Si ſibi permittatur in his tribus capitibus* [viz. *forma publicarum precum, de ritibus Baptiſmi, de formâ Euchariſtiæ, ſive Miſſæ*) *Chriſtianam formam ad normam priſcæ Eccleſiæ Inſtitutam legi, confidere ſe quod ex quinquaginta mill. quos habet in ſuâ Diœceſi à præſenti diſciplina Eccleſiæ diverſos, quadraginta millia ad Eccleſiaſticam unionem ſit reducturus*] That is, If he had but leave in theſe three heads (the form of publick Prayers, of the rites of Baptiſm, and the form of the Euchariſt or the Maſs) to follow the Chriſtian form Inſtituted according to the rule of the Antient Church, he was confident that of fifty thouſand that he had in his Dioceſs that differed from the preſent diſcipline of the Church, he ſhould reduce forty thouſand to Eccleſiaſtical union.] By this teſtimony it is plain that the Church of *Rome* hath forſaken the antient Diſcipline and Worſhip of the Church by Innovation; and that the Proteſtants deſire the reſtitution of it, and would be ſatisfied therewith, but cannot obtain it at the Papiſts hands.

So *Caſſander* himſelf, *Epiſt.* 42. *p.* 1138. [I would not deſpair of moderation, if they

they that hold the Church poſſeſſions would remove ſome intolerable abuſes, and would reſtore a tolerable form of the Church, according to the preſcript of the Word of God, and of the antient Church, eſpecially that which flouriſhed for ſome ages after *Conſtantine*, when liberty was reſtored: which if they will not do, and that betime, there is danger they may in many places be caſt out of their poſſeſſions.] Still you ſee *Rome* is the Innovator; and it is Reſtitution of the antient Church-form that would have quieted the Proteſtans, which could never be obtained.

So again more plainly, *Epiſt.* 45. *p.* 1141.

When I came to *London*, I enquired after Mr. *Johnſon*, to know whether I might at all expect any Anſwer to the foregoing Papers, or not: And at laſt inſtead of an Anſwer, I received only theſe enſuing lines.

PAg. 5. *part* 1. *You ſay*, I reply firſt, had not you deſpaired of making good your cauſe, you ſhould have gone by argumentation, till you had forced me to contradict ſome common principle.

Now I have by Argumentation, forced you to this, if you will maintain what after you ſeem to aſſert in divers paſſages, (*viz.*) That Hereticks are true parts of Chriſts Catholick Church; *for thus you write p.* 11. Some are called Hereticks for denying points eſſential to Chriſtianity; thoſe are no Chriſtians, and ſo not in the Church; but many alſo are called Hereticks by you, and by the Fathers for leſſer Errours conſiſtent with Chriſtianity; And theſe may be in the Church: *And p.* 12. *you anſwer thus to your adverſary*: Whereas you ſay it is againſt all antiquity

antiquity and Chriſtianity to admit condemned Hereticks into the Church; I reply firſt, I hate their condemnation, rather then reverence it; *where you ſaying nothing againſt their admittance into the Church, ſeem to grant it.*

I therefore humbly entreate you to declare your opinion more fully in this queſtion; Whether any profeſſed Hereticks, properly ſo called, are true parts of the univerſal viſible Church of Chriſt; ſo that they compoſe one univerſal Church with the other viſible parts of it.

Junii 6to.

William Johnſon.

The Anſwer.

Anſw. My words are plain, and diſtinctly anſwer your queſtion, ſo that I know not what more is needful for the explication of my ſenſe; Unleſs you would call us back from the *Thing* to the meer *Name*, by your [properly ſo called,] you are anſwered already. But I would ſpeak as plainly as I can, and if it be poſſible for me

to be underſtood by you, I ſhall do my part.

1. It is ſuppoſed that you and I are not agreed What *the Univerſal viſible Church* it ſelf is, while you take the Pope, or any meer humane Head to be an eſſential part; which is an aſſertion that with much abhorrence I deny. You think each member of that Church muſt neceſſarily *ad eſſe*, be a ſubject of the Pope; and I think it enough that he be a ſubject of Chriſt; and to his *orderly* and well-being, that he hold local Communion with the parts within the reach of his capacity, and be ſubject to the Paſtors that are ſet over him; maintaining due aſſociation with and charity to the reſt of the more diſtinct members, as he is capable of communion with them at that diſtance. So that when I have proved a perſon to be a member of the Catholick Church, it is not your Catholick Church that I mean: No ſound Chriſtian is a member of yours; it is Hereticks (in the ſofter ſenſe) that are its matter. Its neceſſary therefore that we firſt agree of the Definition of the Catholick Church, before we diſpute who is in it.

2. Your word [Properly ſo called] is ambiguous; referring either to the Etymologie, or to ſome definition in an authentick Canon;

Canon; or to cuſtom and common ſpeech. Of the firſt, we have no reaſon now to enter controverſie: For the ſecond, I know no ſuch ſtabliſht Definition that we are agreed on: For the third, cuſtom is ſo variable here, not agreeing with it ſelf, that what is to be denominated *Proper* or *Improper* from it, is not to be well conjectured. However all this is but *de nomine*; and What is the proper, and What the improper uſe of the word *Heretick*, is no Article of Faith, nor neceſſary for our debate. Therefore again you muſt accept of my diſtinguiſhing, and give me leave to fly confuſion.

1. The word [Heretick] is either ſpoken of one that corrupteth the Doctrine of Faith (as ſuch), or of one that upon ſome difference of Opinion, or ſome perſonal quarrels, withdraweth from the Communion of thoſe particular Churches that before he held communion with, and gathereth a ſeparated party: ſuch are moſt uſually called Schiſmaticks; but of old, the name [Hereticks] was oft applyed unto ſuch.

2. The word [Heretick] in the firſt ſenſe, is either ſpoken of one that (profeſſing the reſt) denyeth ſome one or more eſſential Articles of the Faith, or parts of Chriſtianity; or one that only denyeth not

what is neceſſary to the *Being*, but to the Integrality or ſober and better-being of a Chriſtian.

3. Hereticks are either convict and condemned, or ſuch as never were tryed and judged.

4. Hereticks condemned, are either condemned by their proper Paſtors, or by others.

5. If by others, either by Uſurpers, or by meer equal neighbour conſociate Paſtors.

6. They are condemned either juſtly *clave non errante*, or unjuſtly *clave errante*.

7. They are either judged to be materially, as to the quality of their errour, *Hereticks*; or alſo formally as obſtinate, impenitent and habitually ſtated Hereticks.

Upon theſe neceſſary diſtinctions, I anſwer your Queſtion in theſe Propoſitions.

Prop. 1. As the word [Hereticks] ſignifieth Schiſmaticks as ſuch, ſo Hereticks with drawing from ſome parts of the univerſal Church only, may yet be parts of the whole (even with thoſe parts from which they ſeparate). If they ſay [You are no parts, and therefore we diſown you, and will have no Communion with you] this maketh

maketh neither ceaſe to be parts] and while both own the Head and the Body as ſuch, they have an union *in tertio*, and ſo a communion in the principal reſpects, while they peeviſhly diſclaim it in other reſpects. Beſides that the local or particular Communion, is it that is proper to members of a particular Church, and therefore the renouncing it only ſeparates him from that Church. But it is the general Communion that belongs to us as members of the Church Univerſal, which may be ſtill continued. But ſhould any renounce the Body of Chriſt as ſuch, and ſeparate (not from this or that Church, but) from the whole, or from the Church Univerſal as ſuch, this man would be no member of the Church.

Prop. 2. As the word [Heretick] is taken for one that denyeth any thing eſſential to Chriſtianity ; ſo an Heretick, if latent, is out of the Church *Deo judice*, as to the inviſible part, or ſoul of the Church, (as *Bellarmine* calls it) as a latent Infidel is ; but he may be (if latent) in the outward communion, or (as *Bellarmine* calls him) a dead member, that properly is none ; as the ſtraw and chaffe are in the cornfield.

Prop. 3. Such an Heretick convict and judged

judged by the Paſtors of that particular Church, of which he is a ſubject-member, is accordingly to be avoided, and *in foro illius Eccleſiæ*, is ſo far caſt out of that Church, as the ſentence importeth.

Prop. 4. Such an Heretick, if he be a Paſtor of one Church, and be convict and condemned by the conſociate co-equal Paſtors of the neighbour Churches, is accordingly caſt out from communion of all the Churches, of which they are Paſtors.

Prop. 5. So far as any Chriſtians through the world have ſufficient proof or cogniſance of the ſaid conviction and condemnation, they are all bound accordingly to eſteem the condemned Heretick, and avoid him.

Prop 6. If [Hereſie] be taken for the obſtinate, impenitent reſiſting or rejecting of any point of Faith (that is, of Divine Revelation) which is made ſo plain to the perſon, that nothing but a wicked will could cauſe ſuch reſiſtance or rejection, ſuch perſons being juſtly convicted and condemned as aforeſaid, are to be taken as perſons condemned for obſtinacy and impenitency in any other ſin; and are out of the Church, as far as a man condemned for impenitency in drunkenneſs or fornication is.

Prop.

Prop. 7. Hereſie taken in this ſofter ſenſe (for the denyal of a truth of Divine revelation, not eſſential to the Chriſtian Religion, or neceſſary to the Being of a Chriſtian) excludeth no man from the Church of it ſelf, unleſs they are legally convict of wicked Impenitency and obſtinacy in defending it.

Prop. 8. A ſentence paſſed *in alieno foro*, by an Uſurper that hath no true Authority thereto, proveth no man an Heretick.

Prop. 9. A ſentence paſſed by an Authorized Paſtor, (or by many) if it be notoriouſly unjuſt, *clave errante*, proveth no man an Heretick, or out of the Univerſal Church.

Prop. 10. A ſentence paſſed by one Church, or many conſociate, binds none to take the condemned perſon to be an Heretick, and out of the Univerſal Church, but thoſe that have ſufficient notice of the Authority of the Judges, and validity of the Evidence, or a ground of *violent preſumption* (as its called) that the ſentence is juſt.

Prop. 11. He that is ſentenced an Heretick or Impenitent by the Paſtors of ſome Churches, and acquit by the equally-authorized Paſtors of other Churches, is not

eo

eo nomine to be condemned or acquit by a third Church, but uſed as the evidence requireth.

Prop. 12. There is an actual excommunication *pro medelâ* and *pro tempore*, due for an actual, willful defence of error, or for other willful ſin; which ſtatedly puts not a man out of the Church; as there is an excommunication *à ſtatu & Relatione*, which is due for ſtated habitual or obſtinate impenitency in that or other great or known ſin.

Having thus diſtinctly told you my judgement how far Hereticks are, or are not in or out of the univerſal Church, I add in order to the application: 1. That this whole debate is nothing to the great difference between you and us, it being not *de fide* in your own account, but a *dogma theologicum*, which you differ about among your ſelves: *Bellarmine* tells you *Alphonſus a Caſtro* maintaineth that *Hereticks are in the Church* (de Eccleſ. l. 3. c. 4.) And he himſelf ſaith that *hæretici pertinent ad Eccleſiam ut oves ad ovile unde confugerunt*, ibid. c. 4. ſo that they are *oves* ſtill, and if it be but *ovile particulare* (*veluti Romanum*) that they fly from, and not the *Univerſal*, that proves them not out of the *Univerſal Church*.

And

And *Bellarmine* ſaith of the *Catechumen. & Excommunicatis*, that they are *de anima, etſi non de corpore Eccleſiæ*, ib. c. 2. *and may be ſaved*, cap. 6. And the *anima Eccleſiæ* is not incorporated in the world without: All that have that ſoul, are of that Church which Chriſt (that animateth his members) is the head of. Which made *Melchior Canus* (*ſatente Bellarmino de Eccl. l.* 3. *c.* 3.) confeſs the being of that which indeed is the true Catholike Church, ſaying of the *Unbaptized Believers*, that [*ſunt de Eccleſia quæ comprehendit omnes fideles ab Abel uſque ad conſummationem mundi.*]

2. Many Popes have been condemned for Hereticks, even by General Councils, as not only *Honorius* (by two or three) but *Eugenius* by the Council of *Baſil*, when yet he kept his place, and the reſt come in as his ſucceſſors. And your writers frequently confeſs that a Pope may be an Heretick (as Pope *Adrian* himſelf affirmeth.) Now if theſe are not of the Church, then they are not Heads of the Church, and then being eſſential parts of your Church, it followeth that your Church is heretical and unchurched with them. But if theſe Popes may be in the Church (and Heads of yours) while Hereticks, then ſo may others.

3. Its

3. Its commonly ſaid by others (of yours) as well as *Bellarmine*, that the Councils were miſinformed about *Honorius*, (and the Popes that conſented to thoſe Councils) and ſo that he was not a Heretick nor out of the Church: Alſo that a Pope may erre in matter of fact, and unjuſtly excommunicate. If ſo, a Pope and Council may erre about another, as well as about *Honorius* or other Popes; and therefore their ſentence be no proof that ſuch are out of the Church, no more then that he and *Eugenius* were out.

4. As the Pope and his Synods condemn the Greeks, ſo the Greeks condemn and excommunicate you; as formerly the Patriarch of *Conſtantinople*, and the Pope have excommunicated each other. I am therefore no more bound to take them for excommunicate perſons, than you, they having as much authority over you as you over them, and their witneſs being to us as credible as yours.

5. The *Abaſſines*, *Armenians*, *Greeks*, &c. are not proved to deny any eſſential point of the Chriſtian Religion, or which is neceſſary to the Being of a Chriſtian or Church.

6. Nor are they proved to be willful, obſtinate

obſtinate and impenitent in defending any errors, with a wicked mind; and ſo to be formally Hereticks in your own ſenſe.

7. They are large Nations, and millions of ſouls, and their Paſtours numerous, ſo that its impoſſible they ſhould be all legally by you convicted. They never ſpake for themſelves, nor were witneſſes heard againſt them. *Noxa caput ſequitur.* Guilt of Hereſie is to be proved of each individual whom you condemn. If a few Biſhops were Hereticks, or a Prince were ſuch, that proves not that the reſt, and all the Paſtors, or people, even to many millions are ſuch. Or if half had been ſuch in former ages, that proves not that half or any are ſuch now. Chriſt never appointed the excommunicating of millions for the ſakes of a few of their Rulers, nor of whole Nations unheard; but of ſingle perſons upon a juſt and equal tryal. If therefore your Pope, or any of his Councils, (which you falſly call General) do excommunicate or condemn *Habaſſia*, *Armenia*, *Georgia*, *Syria*, and other Nations as Hereticks, it is ſo far from unchurching them, or proving them ſuch, as that it is one of the greateſt ſins that can be committed by the ſons of men, with inhumane injuſtice, cruelty, pride and arrogancy,

arrogancy, preſuming to paſs a damning ſentence on ſo many millions of ſouls, whoſe faces you never ſaw, nor were ever called to a legal tryal.

8. Your own writers ordinarily acquit the Greeks from Hereſie; and thoſe of them that have travelled to other Countries, as *Syria*, &c. acquit moſt of them, as I have proved in former writings out of their own words (not needful therefore here to be recited, when you may ſee any writings.]

9. Your Pope (and Biſhops) is none of their authorized Paſtor, and therefore hath no power as ſuch to judge them. And as neighbour Churches they have as much to do to judge you as you to judge them. Therefore they are never the more out of the Church for your judgement, any more than you for theirs.

10. There are as many and as great errors proved by them to be in your Church as is by you to be in theirs: ſo that (in ſum) your cauſe being much worſe, and your cenſure of them proving you guilty of ſuch inhumane cruelty, injuſtice, arrogancy, uſurpation, *&c.* by condemning them, you go much nearer to prove your ſelves no Chriſtians and no Church than them.

11. And yet I think the far greateſt part of

of them (many thouſands to one) are not actually excommunicated or condemned by any pretended ſentence of your own, whatever your writers may ſay of them, and whatever one Council might ſay of ſome few in ſome one age.

12. Laſtly, It can be no matter of certainty to you your ſelf, or any of you, that theſe Nations or Churches are Hereticks, both becauſe it is a thing that none of your approved Councils have determined of, as to any perſon now living, nor to any conſiderable number comparatively, in other ages; and alſo becauſe you confeſs your Pope and Councils fallible in theſe caſes, of fact and perſonal application. You cannot therefore build upon ſuch acknowledged uncertainties.

BUt Sir, having thus anſwered your demand, I muſt ask you, whats all this to the Anſwer of my laſt Papers, which I have now near a year expected from you? I ſuſpected ſome ſuch tergiverſation, when I took the boldneſs to urge you ſo hard to the tasks that you were reaſonably engaged to perform, *viz.* 1. To prove by cloſe Argumentation, the nullity of our Churches,

as you begun in your firſt Argument. 2. To anſwer my proofs of our ſucceſſive viſibility. 3. To prove your own ſucceſſive viſibility in all ages ſince Chriſt, as I have proved ours. I do therefore once more urge you ſpeedily to do this, aſſuring you that elſe I muſt take it for an open deſerting of your Cauſe.

But yet I muſt add, that if you will pleaſe to diſpute the main cauſe in difference between us, upon equal terms; we have yet other Queſtions in which we differ, that are lower then theſe, and nearer the foundation. Beſides the forementioned work therefore, I deſire, that you will diſpute the main Cauſe, in two diſtinct diſputations, in one of which be you the Opponent, and bring your ſtrongeſt Arguments againſt the Reformed Churches and Religion; and in the other I will be Opponent and argue againſt Popery; in the beginning agreeing upon the ſenſe of thoſe terms that we are like to have greateſt uſe of through our diſputation. If you will but let us meet, and ſtate our ſenſe of ſuch terms, before I return into the Country, that we may the better manage it after at a diſtance, it will be worth our labour: And for verbal diſpute, I ſhall at any

any fit time and place moſt cheerfully entertain it, if ſo many doubting perſons may be preſent, as that it may be worth our labour. In the mean time I pray pardon it, if the roughneſs of any paſſages diſcover the frailty of

Your Servant,

June 7. 1660.

R. Baxter.

---

28 MR 59

Mr. *Johnsons*
EXPLICATION
OF
Some of the most used TERMS:
WITH
QUERIES
Thereupon: And his ANSWER:
And my REPLY.

LONDON, Printed, 1660.

BRITISH MUSEUM

AFter the writing of the foregoing Paper, I again urged Mr. Johnſon *to the ſpeedy anſwering my Papers: Of which when he gave me no hope, I committed them to the Preſs. But afterward, he ſeemed more inclinable both to that, and to a Verbal conference: And in order to both, (if we had opportunity) I deſired him firſt that we might agree on the ſenſe of thoſe terms that are like to be moſt uſed in the ſubſtance of our Controverſie; promiſing him that I will give him my ſenſe of any term, when he ſhall deſire it; and accordingly he explained his ſenſe of many of them as followeth.*

Queries

Queries of R. B. on these definitions, with Mr. Johnsons Answer, and my Reply.

Mr. J.

The Catholick Church of Christ.

THE Catholick Church of Christ is all those visible Assemblies, Congregations, or Communities of Christians, who live in unity of true faith, and external communion one with another, and in dependance of their lawful Pastors.

R. B.

Of the Church.

Qu. 1. Whether you exclude not all those converted among Infidels, that never had external Communion with, nor were members of any particular visible Church, of which you

make the Catholick to be conſtituted?

Mr. J.

Anſw. *It is ſufficient that ſuch be ſubject to the ſupream Paſtor, and* in voto, quantum in ſe eſt, *reſolved to be of that particular Church actually, which ſhall, or may be aſſigned for them by that Paſtor, to be included in my definition.*

R. B. *Reply.*

Q 1. *Repl. ad* 1^m 1. You ſee then that your Definitions ſignifie nothing: no man can know your meaning by them. Firſt you make the Catholick Church to conſiſt only of viſible Aſſemblies: and after you allow ſuch to be members of the Church that are of no viſible Aſſemblies 2. You now mention ſubjection to the ſupream Paſtor as ſufficient, which in your deſcription or definition you did not. 3. If to be only *in voto* reſolved to be of a particular Church will ſerve, then inexiſtence is not neceſſary. To be only *in voto* of the *Catholick Church*, proves no man a member of the Catholick Church, but proves the contrary, becauſe it is *Terminus diminuens*. Seeing then by your own

own confeſſion, *inexiſtence* in a particular Church is not of neceſſity to *inexiſtence* in the Catholike Church; why do you not only mention it in your definition, but confine the Church to ſuch? will you ſay you meant *in voto*? who then can underſtand you, when you ſay they muſt *be of viſible Aſſemblies*, and mean, *they need not be of any, but only to wiſh, deſire or purpoſe it*? 4. But yet you ſay nothing to my caſe in its latitude. Many a one may be converted to Chriſt by a ſolitary Preacher, or by two or three, that never tell him that there is any ſupream Paſtor in the world: How then can he be ſubject to that ſuppoſed Paſtor, that never heard of him? The *Engliſh* and *Dutch* convert many *Indians* to the faith of Chriſt, that never hear of a ſupream Paſtor. 5. If it be neceſſary that a particular Church muſt be aſſigned for ſuch members by the ſupream Paſtor, then they are yet little the better that never have any ſuch aſſignation from him (as few have.)

R. B.

Qu. 2. What is that faith in unity whereof all members of the Catholike Church

Church do live? is it the belief of all that God hath revealed to be believed; or of part? and what part?

Mr. J.

Anſw. *Of all; either explicitly, or implicitly.*

R. B. *Reply.*

Reply, Ad 2^m. Your ſecond anſwer further proves that your definitions ſignifie juſt nothing. They muſt *live* in unity of the faith: that is, either *with faith* or *without it*: *with a belief* of what God hath revealed to be believed, or *without it*. For to *believe* any point *implicitly*, in your ordinary ſenſe, is *not to believe it*, but only to believe one of the Premiſes, whence the concluſion muſt be inferred. But why do you not tell me what you mean by [*an Implicite faith*]? Faith is called Implicite in ſeveral ſenſes. 1. When ſeveral truths are actually underſtood and believed *in confuſo*, or in groſs, in ſome one propoſition which containeth the ſubſtance of them all; but not with accurate diſtinct conceptions, nor ſuch as are ripe for any fit expreſſion: This *indiſtinct, immature, imperfect*

perfect kind of apprehenſion may be called Implicite; and the *diſtinct* and more digeſted conceptions *Explicite*. 2. When a general propoſition is believed as the *matter* of our faith, but the *particulars* are not *underſtood* or not believed: As to believe that *omne animal vivit*, not knowing whether *you* are *Animal* or *Cadaver*. Or to believe that [all that is in the Scripture is the Word of God and true,] but not to know [what is in the Scripture]. 3. When it is only the formal object of faith that is believed, without underſtanding the *material* object.

The firſt ſort of theſe, I confeſs, is *Actual Belief*, though *indiſtinct*: But I ſuppoſe you mean not this. 1. Becauſe it is not the ordinary ſenſe of your party. 2. Becauſe elſe you damn either all the world, or moſt of your own profeſſed-party at leaſt as no members of the Church: for few or none have an *Actual underſtanding and belief* of all that ever God revealed to them; becauſe all men (or moſt at leaſt) have been ſinfully negligent in ſearching after, and receiving truth; and ſo are ſinfully ignorant: No man knoweth all that God hath revealed, or that he ought to know. 3. Becauſe by this rule it is impoſſible for you or any man

man to know who is indeed a member of your Church; for you cannot know mens confuſed knowledge, or know that it extendeth to all revealed: For if you ſpeak of all *revealed* in *general*, or in *Scripture*, you ſtill damn all, (or moſt in your own ſenſe) for none, as I ſaid, underſtand it all to a word: But if you ſpeak of all which that particular man hath had ſufficient means to know, it is then impoſſible for you to make a judgement of any mans faith by this: For you can never diſcern all the means (internal or external) that ever he had; much leſs can you diſcern whether his faith be commenſurate to the truth ſo far revealed. So that by this courſe you make your Church *inviſible*. I pray tell me how you can avoid it?

2. The ſecond ſort of *Implicite Belief*, is no *Belief* of the particulars at all. An *Animal* may *live*, and yet it followeth not that you are *alive* or an *animal*. If this were your meaning, then either you mean [that it is enough if *all* be believed *Implicitly* beſides that general propoſition]; or you mean that ſome muſt be believed *explicitly* (that is actually) and ſome Implicitly, (that is, not at all). If the former be your ſenſe, then Infidels or Heathens may be of your Church.

Church. For a man may believe in general that [the Bible is the Word of God and true] and yet not know a word thats in it; and ſo not know that Chriſt is the Meſſias, or that ever there was ſuch a perſon. But if *ſomewhat* muſt be *explicitely* (that is, *Actually*) believed, the Queſtion that you ſhould have anſwered was, [What is it?] For till that be known, no man can know a Member of your Church by your deſcription.

3. If you take [*Implicite*] in the third ſenſe, then *Implicite faith* is either *Divine* or *Humane*. *Divine*, when the *Divine Veracity* is the formal *Object*. *Humane*, when mans Veracity is the formal Object. Which may be *Conjunct* where the Teſtimonies are ſo conjunct, as that we are ſure it is God that ſpeaks by man, who is therefore credible becauſe God infallibly guideth or inſpireth him: This is at once to believe a *Humane* and *Divine* Veracity. If any of this be your meaning, the laſt queſtions remain ſtill to be reſolved by you. A man may believe that [*God is true*,] and that [his *Prophets* or *inſpired meſſengers are true*] and yet not underſtand a word of the meſſage: ſo that ſtill if this will ſerve, a man may be of your Church that knoweth not that ever

the e

there was ſuch a perſon as Jeſus Chriſt, or that ever he died for our ſins, or roſe again, or that we ſhall riſe. And are Infidels of your Church while you are arguing us out? But if there be ſome truths beſides the Veracity of God (and his Meſſengers) that muſt be believed, you muſt ſhew what it is, or your Church-members cannot be known. Tell me therefore without tergiverſation, [what are the revealed truths that muſt actually be believed] or [what is the faith materially, in unity whereof all members of the Catholike Church do live?] I pray fly not, but plainly tell me.

And if again you fly to *uncertain points*, becauſe of the diverſity of means of information, and ſay, [It muſt be ſo much to every man as he had means to know] I again anſwer you. 1. If a man had no means to know that there is a Chriſt, it ſeems then he is one of your Church. 2. You ſtill damn all your own, there being not a man that knoweth all that he had means to know, becauſe all have culpably neglected means. And ſo you have no Church. 3. Still you make your Church inviſible (if you had any:) For no man can tell, as I ſaid, who *knoweth* in full proportion to his helps and means. Do you not ſee now whi-

ther

ther your *Implicite* faith hath brought you?

R. B.

Qu. 3. Is it *any lawful* Paſtors, or *All*, that muſt neceſſarily be depended on by every member? and who are theſe Paſtors?

Mr. J.

Anſw. *Of all, reſpectively to each ſubject; that is, that the authority of none of them, mediate or immediate, be rejected or contemned by him, that is a true member of the Church.*

R. B. *Reply.*

Ad Qu. 3. *R. Reply* 1. Here ſtill you tell me that your deſcriptions ſignified nothing. You told me that the members muſt [live in dependance on their lawful Paſtors.] And now you tell me that [their authority muſt not be rejected or contemned.] And indeed, is *dependance* and *non-rejection* all one? The millions of heathens that never heard of the Pope or any of your Paſtors *reject* them not, nor *contemn* them: Are

Are they therefore fit matter for your Church? 2. If you ſay, that you mean it of ſuch only as have a ſufficient Revelation of the Authority of theſe Paſtors, I further reply. 1. It ſeems then it is not only the Pope, but every Prieſt reſpectively that is an eſſential member of your Church; or to whom each member muſt be ſubject neceſſarily *ad eſſe*. If ſo, then every man that by falling out or prejudice, doth culpably reject the authority of any one Paſtor or Prieſt among a ſwarm, is damned, or none of the Church, though he believe in the Pope and in twenty thouſand Prieſts beſides.

2. And then have we not cauſe to pray God to bleſs us from the company of your Prieſts? or at leaſt, that we may not have too many, when among a multitude we may be in danger of rejecting ſome one, and then we are caſt out of the Church! What if a Gentleman ſhould find ſome ſuch as *Watſon* or *Montaltus* deſcribe in bed with his wife, or a Prince find a *Garnet*, a *Campion*, or a *Parſons* in a Treaſon, and by ſuch a temptation ſhould be ſo weak, as to contemn, or reject the authority of that ſingle Prieſt, while he honoureth all the reſt: Is it certain, that ſuch a man is none of the Catholike

tholike Church for that? How hard is it in *France* and *Italy* then to be a Catholike, where Prieſts are ſo numerous, that its ten to one, but among the crowd the authority of ſome one may be rejected!

3. But is it all the Prieſts that we never knew, or knew not to be Prieſts, that we muſt depend on, or is it only thoſe whoſe authority is manifeſted to us by ſufficient evidence? Doubtleſs you will confine our dependance to theſe only (or elſe no man could be a Chriſtian:) And if ſo, you know we are never the nearer a reſolution for your anſwer, till you yet tell us how we muſt know our Paſtors to have authority indeed. What if they ſhew me the Biſhops orders, and I know that many have had forged Orders? am I bound to believe in his authority? what if I be utterly ignorant whether he that ordained him, were himſelf ordained? or had *intentionem ordinandi*? how ſhall I then be ſure of his authority that is ordained? And how can the people be acquainted with the paſſages in Election and Ordination that are neceſſary to the knowledge of their authority? eſpecially of the Popes and prelates. And what if you tell me your own opinion, of the *ſufficient means* by which I muſt be convinced

of the Popes and Prieſts authority? how ſhall I know that you are not deceived; and that theſe are the ſufficient means indeed, unleſs a General Council have defined them to be ſufficient? And if they have, if it were not as an Article of faith, you'l ſay I am not bound of neceſſity to believe their definition. And what if I have ſufficient means to know the authority of a thouſand Prieſts, but am culpably ignorant of it in ſome few through my neglect? Doth it follow that therefore I am out of the Church? Is my obedience to each Prieſt as neceſſary, as my belief of every Article of my faith? If ſo, I know not whether your multiplying Articles, or multiplying Prieſts, doth fill hell faſter, if men muſt be judged by your laws. But it is our Allegiance to our Soveraign, that is the character of a Subject in the Common-wealth, and not our Allegiance, or duty to every inferiour Magiſtrate: the rejection of one of them may ſtand with ſubjection, though not with innocency: It is not treaſon to reject a Conſtable: why then ſhould more be neceſſary to our Church-membership and ſalvation?

But ſtill you make your Church inviſible: For as no man can know that liveth in the remote parts of the world, whether your

Popes

Popes themſelves are truly Popes, as being duly qualified and elected, nor which is the true Pope, when you have oft had more then one at once; ſo you can never know concerning your members, whether their dependance on their Paſtors be extenſively proportionate to the means that diſcovered their authority? and whether their diſobedience unchurch them or no? I earneſtly crave your anſwer to the thirty uncertainties, which I have mentioned in my *Safe Religion*, p. 93, to 104. And tell us how all our Paſtours may be known. And whether every particular ſin unchurch men? and if not, why the contempt or rejection of a drunken Prieſt doth it, while all the reſt are (perhaps too much) honoured?

R. B.

Queſt. 4. Why exclude you the chief Paſtors, that depend on none?

Mr. J.

Anſw. *I exclude them not, but include them, as thoſe of whom all the reſt depend; as St.* Hierom *does in his definition*, Eccleſia eſt plebs Epiſcopo unita.

Repl. ad Reſp. ad Queſt. 4. How unconſtant are you among your ſelves in the uſe of terms? How frequent is it with you to appropriate the name of [the Church] to the Clergy? But remember hereafter, when you tell us of the Determinations, and Traditions of the Church, that it is the people that you mean, and not only the Paſtors in Council; much leſs the Pope alone.

Mr. J.

Hereſie.

Is an intellectual obſtinate oppoſition againſt divine authority revealing, when it is ſufficiently propounded.

R. B.

Of Hereſie.

Is the oppoſition and obſtinacy that makes Hereſie, in the Intellect or will?

Mr. J.

Mr. J.

In the Will, by an imperate *Act, restraining the understanding to that errour.*

R. B. *Reply.*

Of Heresie.

Qu. 1. *Reply* 1. Still your descriptions signifie just nothing. You describe *Heresie* to be *An Intellectual* obstinate *Opposition*; and yet say that this is *in the Will.* And yet again you contradict your self by saying that it is an *Imperate act.* No *Imperate* act is *in the will*, though it be *from the will.* It is *voluntary*, but not *in voluntate.* An *Imperant* act may be in the will, but not *Imperate.* All *Imperate* acts are in (or immediately by the commanded faculties.) The *Intelligere*, which is the Imperate act, is in the *Intellect*: though the *Velle intelligere*, which is an Elicite act, be in the will. 2. From hence its plain that you cannot prove me or any man to be an Heretick that is unfeignedly willing to know the truth, and is not obstinately willful in opposing it: which are things that you cannot ordinarily

diſcern and prove by others, that are ready to be ſworn that they would fain know the truth.

R. B.

Qu. 2. Muſt it needs be againſt the *Formal object* of Faith? is he no Heretick, that denieth the matter revealed, without oppoſing obſtinately the Authority revealing?

Mr. J.

Anſw. *Yes. Nor is he a* Formal, *but only a* Material *Heretick, who oppoſes a revealed Truth, which is not ſufficiently propounded to him to be a Divine revelation.*

R. B. *Reply.*

Qu. 2. *Reply* 2. Every man that believeth that there is a God indeed, believeth that he is true: For if he be not *True*, he is not *God*. If therefore no man be *Formally* an Heretick, that doth not obſtinately oppoſe the *Veracity* of God, which is the formal object, then as there are I hope but few Hereticks in the world, ſo thoſe few cannot

cannot by ordinary means be known to you: unleſs they will ſay that they take God to be a lyar, ſo that you make none Hereticks indeed but Atheiſts.

What if a man deny that there is a Chriſt, a Heaven, a Hell, or a Reſurrection? and alſo deny the *Revelation* it ſelf, by which he ſhould diſcern theſe truths? and yet deny not the *Veracity* of God, (no nor of the Church?) is this no Heretick? I would your party that have murdered ſo many thouſands as Hereticks, had ſo judged: (if a falſhood may be wiſhed, as a thing permitted, to have prevented ſuch a miſchief.) It is not Gods *Veracity* that is commonly denyed by Hereticks, but the *thing revealed*, and the *Revelation of that thing*: And your *Turnebul* againſt *Baronius* hath told you, that the Revelation is no part of the *Formal* object of faith, but as it were the *Copula*, or a condition *ſine qua non*. If he that obſtinately refuſeth to believe that the Godhead of Chriſt, or the Holy Ghoſt is any where by God revealed, and ſo denyeth it, be no Heretick, unleſs he alſo obſtinately deny or reſiſt the *Veracity* of God; then there are few that you can prove Hereticks. (For *forma dat nomen*; and he that is not a Heretick *Formally*, but *materially only*, is no Heretick at all.)

Laſtly, many a truth is ſinfully neglected by the members of the Church; that have a propoſal *ſufficient*, and yet not *effectual* through their own fault: and yet they are no Hereticks. Millions in your Church are ignorant of truths ſufficiently propoſed, and therefore their ignorance is their ſin: but it followeth not that it is their Hereſie. But if it be, then Hereticks conſtitute your Church; and then your Church is a thing unknown; becauſe the Hereticks cannot be known, the ſufficiency of each mans revelation being much unknown to others.

R. B.

Qu. 3. What mean you by a *ſufficient propoſal?*

Mr J.

Anſw. *I mean ſuch a propoſal as is ſufficient* in humanis, *to oblige one to take notice, that a King, or chief Magiſtrate, have enacted ſuch, or ſuch Laws, &c. that is, a publick Teſtimony, that ſuch things are revealed by the infallible authority of thoſe who are the higheſt Tribunal of Gods Church; or*

by

R. B. *Reply.*

Qu. 3. *Reply* 1. *In humanis* there lieth not ſo much at the ſtake as a mans ſalvation: and man is not ſo able as God to make a truly ſufficient revelation of his will to all; and therefore the proportion holds not. 2. But if it did, either you think the *ſufficiency* varieth according to the variety of advantages, opportunities, and capacities of the perſons, or elſe that it conſiſteth only in the act of common publication, and ſo is the ſame to all the ſubjects. If the firſt be your ſenſe (as I ſuppoſe it is,) then ſtill you are uncertain who are Hereticks, as being uncertain of mens various capacities, and ſo of the *ſufficiency* in queſtion. Unleſs you will conclude (with me) that thus you make all Hereticks, as aforeſaid; becauſe all men living are culpably ignorant of ſome truths, which they had a revelation of that was thus far ſufficient. If the ſecond be your ſenſe, then the ſame unhappy conſequence will follow (that all are Hereticks;) and moreover, that ſome of obſcure education are unavoidably Hereticks, becauſe they had no opportunity to know thoſe things,

things, which as to the Majority, are of *publick teſtimony* or *univerſal Tradition.* Is not the Bible, a publick Teſtimony and record, and being univerſally received, is an univerſal Tradition? And yet abundance of truths in the holy Bible are unknown, (and therefore not actually believed) by millions that are in your Church, and are not taken by your ſelves for Hereticks. Your befriending ignorance would elſe make very many Hereticks.

Mr. J.

Pope.

By Pope, I mean St. Peter, *or any of his lawful Succeſſors in the See of* Rome, *having authority by the Inſtitution of Chriſt, to govern all particular Chriſtian Churches, next under Chriſt.*

R. B.

Of the Pope.

Qu. 1. I am never the nearer knowing the

the Pope by this, till I know, how *Peters* Succeſſors may be known to me. What perſonal qualification is neceſſary *ad eſſe?*

Mr. J.

Anſw. *Such as is neceſſary* ad eſſe *for other Biſhops; which I ſuppoſe you know.*

R. B. *Reply.*

Of the Pope.

Qu. 1. *Reply.* If ſo, then all thoſe were no Popes that were Hereticks, or denied eſſential points of faith (as *Johan.* 23.) and ſo were no Chriſtians; and all thoſe that wanted the neceſſary abilities to the eſſentials of their work. And ſo your Church hath oft been headleſs, and your ſucceſſion interrupted, Councils having cenſured many Popes to be thus unqualified: And the *diſpoſitio materiæ* being of it ſelf neceſſary to the reception of the form, it muſt needs follow, that ſuch were no Popes, even before the Councils charged them with incapacity or Hereſie: becauſe they *had it*, before they were accuſed of it. And Simony then made many uncapable.

R. B.

R. B.

Qu. 2. When and how muſt the inſtitution of Chriſt be found?

Mr. J.

Anſw. *In the revealed Word of God, written or unwritten.*

R. B. *Reply.*

Qu. 2. *Reply* 1. You never gave the world aſſurance, how they may truly know the meaſure of your *unwritten Word*, nor where to find it, ſo as to know what it is. 2. Till you prove *Chriſts Inſtitution* (which you have never done,) you free us from believing in the Pope.

R. B.

Qu. 3. Will any ones election prove one to be Pope? or who muſt elect him *ad eſſe*?

Mr. J.

Anſw. *Such as by approved cuſtome, are eſteemed,*

eſteemed, by thoſe to whom it belongs, fit for that charge; and with whoſe election the Church is ſatisfied.

R. B. *Reply.*

Qu. 3. *Reply.* Here you are fain to hide your ſelf inſtead of anſwering; and ſhew indeed that a Pope (thats made an eſſential part of the Church; ſubjection to whom is made of neceſſity to ſalvation) is indeed but a meer name, or a thing unknown; and ſo can be certainly believed or acknowledged by none. For either *Election* of him (by ſome body) is neceſſary, or not. If *not*, then you or another man unchoſen may be Pope, for ought I know, or any man elſe. If *yea*; then it is either *any bodies Election* of him that will ſerve turn, or not. If *it will*, then you may be Pope, if your Scholars chooſe you, and then you have had three true Popes at once; for ſo many were *Elected*. But if *it will not*, then it muſt be known who hath the *Power of Election*, before it can be known who is indeed the Pope: But you are forced here by your anſwer to intimate to us, that the *Power* of *Election* cannot be known: and therefore the Pope cannot be known. For,

1. Here

1. Here are no determinate Electors mentioned; and therefore it ſeems none known to you: And no wonder: for if you confine it to the people, or to the Cardinals, or to the Emperours, or to Councils, you cut off all your Popes that were choſen by the other waies. 2. Nor do you determine of any particular diſcernable note, by which the Electors, and power of election may be known to the Church: But all theſe patches make up your deſcription. 1. It muſt be thoſe that are eſteemed fit for the charge. 2. And that by thoſe to whom it belongs. 3. And that by *cuſtome*. 4. And that *approved*. 5. And the Church muſt be ſatisfied with the election. O miſerable body then that hath been ſo oft headleſs, as *Rome* hath been! 1. Will *eſteeming* them *fit*, ſerve turn though they be unfit? then it is not the *fitneſs* that is neceſſary, but the *eſtimation*, (true or falſe.) 2. But why did you not tell us *to whom* it is that it belongs to *eſteem* the *Chooſers fit*? Here you were at a ſtreight. But is not this to ſay nothing while you pretend to ſpeak? and to hide what you pretend to open? 3. And who knows what cuſtome, and of what continuance you mean? Primitive cuſtom went one way; and *afterward* cuſtom went another way;

way; and later cuſtom hath varied from both; and hath the power of Election changed ſo oft? 4. And who is it that muſt *approve* this cuſtom? and what approbation muſt there be? All theſe are meer *hiding*, and not reſolving of the doubt, and tell us that a Pope is a thing inviſible or unknown. 5. And your *laſt* aſſureth us, that your ſucceſſion was interrupted through many uſurpations, yea indeed that you never had a Pope. For the Church was unſatisfied with the election of abundance of your Popes, when Whores, and Simony, and Murder, and power ſet them up: And moſt of the Church through the world is unſatisfied with them ſtill to this day. And you have no way to know whether the greater part of the Church is ſatisfied or not; for non-reſiſtance is no ſign of ſatisfaction, where men have not opportunity or power to reſiſt. And when one part of Europe was for one Pope, and another for another through ſo many Schiſms, who knows which had the *approbation* of that which may be called the Church?

R. B.

Qu. 4. Is Conſecration neceſſary? and by whom *ad eſſe*? Anſw.

Mr. J.

Answ. *It is not absolutely necessary* ad esse.

R. B. *Reply.*

Qu. 4. *Reply.* If consecration be not necessary to the Papacy, then it is not necessary that this or that man consecrate him more then another. And then it is not necessary to a Bishop. And then the want of it makes no interruption in succession, in any Church, any more then in yours.

R. B.

Qu. 5. What notice, or proof is necessary to your Subjects?

Mr. J.

Answ. *So much as is necessary to oblige them, to accept of other Elected Princes to be their Soveraigns.*

R. B. *Reply.*

Qu. 5. *Reply.* When you have answered to the forementioned thirty doubts, we shall

ſhall know what that general ſignifieth.

Mr. J.

Biſhops.

I mean by Biſhop, ſuch a Chriſtian Paſtor as hath power, and juriſdiction, to govern the inferior Paſtors, Clergy, and people within his Dioceſſe, and to confer holy orders to ſuch as are ſubject to him.

R. B.

Of Biſhops.

Qu. 1. Do you mean, that he muſt have this *jure divino, or humano?* and if *jure divino*, whether mediately or immediately?

Mr. J.

Anſw. *The definition abſtracts from particulars, and ſubſiſts without determining that queſtion.*

R. B. *Reply.*

Of Biſhops.

Qu. 1. *Repl.* 1. You before ſeem to yeild that the Papacy is but *jure humano*; (and therefore ſure of no neceſſity to ſalvation:) For if man can change the power of election, and the foundation be humane, its like the relation is but humane. And therefore if Biſhops muſt be *jure divino*, they are more excellent and neceſſary then the Pope. 2. How groſs a ſubterfuge is this? either the Biſhop in queſtion is a *divine* creature or a *humane*: If a *divine*; as you *may* maniſeſt it, or expreſs it at leaſt, ſo you *ought*; it being no *indifferent* thing to turn a divine office and Church into an humane: If he be *not Divine*, he is not of neceſſity to a divine Church, nor to ſalvation. And yet thus your *R. Smith* Biſhop of *Calcedon* (*ubi ſupra*) confeſſeth it to be no point of your faith, that the Pope is St. *Peters* ſucceſſor *jure divino*. And if you leave it indifferent to be believed, or not, that both your Pope and Biſhops are *jure divino*, you confeſs you are but a humane policy or ſociety, and therefore that no man need to fear the loſs of his ſalvation by renouncing you.

Qu. 2.

R. B.

Qu. 2. How ſhall we know who hath this power? what Election, or Conſecration is neceſſary thereto? If I know not, who hath it, I am never the better.

Mr. J.

Anſw. *As you know, who hath Temporal Power, by an univerſal, or moſt common conſent of the people: The Election is different according to different times, places, and other circumſtances. Epiſcopal Conſecration is not abſolutely neceſſary.*

R. B. *Reply.*

Qu. 2. *Repl.* 1. How now! Are all the myſteries of your ſucceſſion and miſſion reſolved into *Popular Conſent*? Is no one way of *Election* neceſſary? Do you leave that to be varied as a thing indifferent? And is Epiſcopal Conſecration alſo unneceſſary? I pray you here again remember then, that none of our Churches are diſabled from the plea of a continued ſuc-

ceſſion, for want of Epiſcopal Conſecration, or any way of Election; If our Paſtors have had the peoples conſent, they have been true Paſtors, according to this reckoning: And if they *have now* their conſent, they *are* true Paſtors. But we have more.

2. By this rule we cannot know of one Biſhop of an hundred whether he be a Biſhop or no; for we cannot know that he hath the *Common conſent of the people:* yea we know that abundance of your Biſhops have no ſuch conſent: yea we know that your Pope hath none of the *conſent* of moſt of the Chriſtians in the world; nor (for ought you or any man knows) of moſt in Europe. Its few of your own party that know who is Pope, (much leſs are called to Conſent,) till after he is ſettled in poſſeſſion.

3. According to this rule, your ſucceſſions have been frequently interrupted, when againſt the will of general Councils, and of the far greateſt part of Chriſtians, your Popes have kept the ſeat by force.

4. In temporals your rule is not univerſally true. What if the people be engaged to one Prince, and afterward break their vow, and conſent to a Uſurper? Though in this caſe a particular perſon may be obliged to ſubmiſ-

ſubmiſſion and obedience in judicial adminiſtrations; yet the uſurper cannot thereby defend his Right, and juſtifie his poſſeſſion, nor the people juſtifie their adheſion to him, while they lye under an obligation to diſclaim him, becauſe of their preengagement to another. Though ſome part of the truth be found in your aſſertion.

R. B.

Qu. 3. Will any Dioceſs ſerve *ad eſſe?* what if it be but in particular Aſſemblies?

Mr. J.

Anſw. *It muſt be more then a Pariſh, or then one ſingle Congregation, which hath not diffe.ent inferiour Paſtors, and one, who is their ſuperior.*

R. B. *Reply.*

Qu. 3. *Repl.* This is but your naked affirmation. I have proved the contrary from Scriptures, Fathers, and Councils in my diſputation of Epiſcopacy, *viz.* that a Biſhop may be (and of old ordinarily was) over the Presbyters only of one Pariſh, or

ſingle Congregation, or a people no more numerous then our Pariſhes. You muſt ſhew us ſome Scripture, or general Council for the contrary before we can be ſure you here ſpeak truth. Was *Gregory Thaumaturgus* no Biſhop, becauſe when he came firſt to *Neocæſarea*, he had but ſeventeen ſouls in his charge? The like I may ſay of many more.

Mr. J.

Tradition.

I underſtand by Tradition the viſible delivery from hand to hand in all ages, of the revealed Word of God, either written, or unwritten.

R. B.

Of Tradition.

Qu. 1. But all the doubt is, by whom this Tradition that's valid, muſt be By your Paſtors, or people, or both? By Pope, or Councils, or Biſhops diſjunct? By the *Major* part of the

the Church, or Biſhops (or *Presbyters*) or the *Minor?* and by how many?

Mr. J.

Anſw. *By ſuch and ſo many proportionably as ſuffice in a Kingdom to certifie the people, which are the Ancient univerſally received cuſtoms in that Kingdom, which is to be morally conſidered.*

R. B. *Reply.*

Of Tradition.

Qu. 1. *Repl.* I conſent to this general. But then, 1. How certainly is Tradition againſt you, when moſt of the Chriſtian world, yea all except an intereſſed party, do deny your Soveraignty, and plead Tradition againſt it? And how lame is your Tradition, when its carried on your private affirmations, and is nothing but the unproved ſayings of a Sect!

R. B.

Qu. 2. What proof, or notice of it, muſt ſatisfie me in particular, that it ſo paſt?

Mr. J.

Anſw. *Such, as with proportion is a ſufficient proof, or notice, of the Laws and cuſtoms of temporal Kingdoms.*

R. B. *Reply.*

Qu. 2. *Repl.* But is it neceſſary for every Chriſtian, to be able to weigh the credit of contradicting parties, when one half of the world ſaith one thing, and the other another thing? what opportunity have ordinary Chriſtians to compare them, and diſcern the moral advantages on each ſide? As in the caſe of the Popes Soveraignty, when two or three parts of the Chriſtian world is againſt it, and the reſt for it, can private Chriſtians try which party is the more credible? Or is it neceſſary to their ſalvation? If ſo, they are caſt upon unavoidable deſpair. If not, muſt they all take the words of their preſent Teachers? Then moſt of the world muſt believe againſt you, becauſe moſt of the Teachers are againſt you: And then it ſeems mens faith is reſolved into the authority of the Pariſh-Prieſt or their Confeſſors. The Laws of a Kingdom may be eaſier known, then Chriſtian

ſtian doctrines can be known, (eſpecially ſuch as are controverted among us) by meer unwritten Tradition. Kingdoms are of narrower compaſs then the world: And, though the ſenſe of Laws is oft in queſtion, yet the being of them is ſeldom matter of controverſie; becauſe men converſing conſtantly and familiarly with each other, may plainly and fully reveal their minds; when God that condeſcendeth not to ſuch a familiarity, hath delivered his mind by inſpired perſons long ago, with much leſs ſenſible advantages, becauſe it is a life of faith that he directeth us to live.

Mr. J.

General Council.

A general Council, I take to be, an aſſembly of Biſhops and other chief Prelates, called, convened, and confirmed, by thoſe who have ſufficient Spiritual authority to call, convene, and confirme.

R. B.

R. B.

Of a General Council.

Qu. 1. Who is it (*ad eſſe*) that muſt call, convene, confirm it? till I know that, I am never the nearer knowing, what a Council is; and which is one indeed.

Mr. J.

Anſw. *Definitions abſtract from inferior ſubdiviſions. For your ſatisfaction I affirm, it belongs to the Biſhop of* Rome.

R. B. *Reply.*

Qu. 1. *Repl.* 1. If it be neceſſary to the *being* or *validity* of a Council that it be called or confirmed by the Pope, then your definition ſignifieth nothing, if you abſtract from that which is ſo neceſſary an ingredient, unleſs it were preſuppoſed to be underſtood. 2. If it belong to the Biſhop of *Rome* to call a Council as neceſſary to its *being*, then the firſt great General Council, and others following, were *none*; it being certain that they were not called by him.

And

And as certain that he hath never proved any ſuch authority to call them, or confirm them.

R. B.

Qu 2. Muſt it not repreſent all the Catholike Church? Doth not your Definition agree to a Provincial, or the ſmalleſt Council?

Mr. J.

Anſw. *Yes, my Definition ſpeaks ſpecifically of Biſhops and chief Prelates, as contradiſtinct from inferiour Paſtors and Clergy, and thereby compriſes all the* Individuums *contained in the* Species; *and conſequently makes a diſtinction from National, or particular Councils, where* ſome *Biſhops only are convened, not* all; *that being only ſome part, and not the whole* Species, *or ſpecifical Notion applied to Biſhops of every age. And yet I ſaid not* all Biſhops, *but* Biſhops and chief Prelates; *becauſe though all are to be called, yet it is not neceſſary that all ſhould come. Whence* appears *what I am to anſwer to the next two Queſtions.*

R. B.

R. B. *Reply.*

Qu. 2. *Repl.* 1. Then you have had no General Councils; much leſs can have any more: For you have none to repreſent the greateſt part of the Church, unleſs by a mock repreſentation.

2. If all muſt be called, your Councils have not been General, that call'd not a great part of the Church.

3. If moſt are neceſſarily detained (as by diſtance, the prohibition of Princes, *&c.*) the call made it not their duty to be there, and ſo makes it not a General Council; which is ſo called from the generality of the meeting and repreſentation, and not of the invitation: no more then a Call would make it a true Council if none came.

R. B.

Qu. 3. How many Biſhops, and from what parts muſt (*ad eſſe*) make ſuch a Council?

Mr. J.

Anſw. *The number is morally to be conſidered, more or fewer according to the difficulties*

ties of times, diſtances of place, and other circumſtances; as is alſo the parts, from whence they are to come.

R. B. *Reply.*

Qu. 3. *Repl.* This is a put-off for want of an Anſwer. Is it a Council if difficulties keep away all? If not, it can be no General Council, when difficulties keep away the moſt. Much leſs when ſuch a petty confederacy as met at Trent, ſhall pretend to repreſent the Chriſtian world. You thus leave us uncertain when a Council is General, and when not. How can the people tell, when you cannot tell your ſelf, when the Biſhops are ſo many as make a Council General!

R. B.

Qu. 4. May none but Biſhops and chief Prelates be members, as you intimate?

Mr. J.

Anſw. *No others; unleſs ſuch inferiours as are ſent to ſupply the places, and as Deputies of thoſe Biſhops or Prelates, are ſuch members of*

of the Council, as have Deciſive votes in framing Decrees and Definitions.

R. B. *Reply.*

Qu. 4. *Repl.* This is but your private opinion. No Council hath defined it, unleſs they are contradictory. For I ſuppoſe you know that *Baſil* and many Councils before it had Presbyters in them.

Mr. J.

Schiſm.

I underſtand by Schiſm, a willfull ſeparation, or diviſion of ones ſelf from the whole viſible Church of Chriſt.

R. B.

Of Schiſm.

Qu. 1. Is it no Schiſm to ſeparate from a particular Church, unleſs from the whole?

Mr. J.

Anſw. *No; it is no Schiſm, as Schiſm is taken*

taken in the Holy Fathers, for that great and capital crime, ſo ſeverely cenſured by them; in which ſenſe only I take it here.

R. B. *Reply.*

Of Schiſm.

Qu. 1. *Repl.* Though I take Schiſm more comprehenſively, and I think, aptly my ſelf, yet hence I obſerve your juſtification of the Proteſtants from the charge of Schiſm; ſeeing they ſeparate not from the Catholike or whole Church: For they ſeparate not from the Armenian, Ethiopian, Greek, *&c.* nor from you as Chriſtians, but as ſcandalous offenders, whom we are commanded to avoid: We ſeparate not from any, but as they ſeparate from Chriſt.

R. B.

Qu. 2. Or is it no Schiſm, unleſs willfull?

Mr. J.

Anſw. *No; it is not Schiſm, unleſs the ſeparation be willfull on his part who makes it.*

R. B.

R. B. *Reply.*

Qu. 2. *Repl.* Again you further juſtifie us from Schiſm. If it be *willfull*, it muſt be againſt knowledge. But we are ſo far from ſeparating *willfully* or *knowingly* from the whole Church, that we abhor the thought of ſuch a thing, as impious and damnable.

R. B.

Qu 3. Is it none, if you make a Diviſion in the Church, and not from the Church?

Mr. J.

Anſw. *Not, as we here underſtand Schiſm, and as the Fathers treat it. For the Church of Chriſt being perfectly one, cannot admit of any proper Schiſm within it ſelf: for that would divide it into two; which is cannot be.*

R. B. *Reply.*

Qu. 3. *Repl.* Though I am ſure *Paul* calls it *Schiſm*, when men make diviſions *in* the Church, though not *from* it; not making it two Churches, but diſlocating ſome members, and abating charity, and cauſing contentions

tentions where there ſhould be peace; yet I accept your continued juſtification of us, who if we ſhould be tempted to be *dividers in* the Church, ſhould yet hate to be dividers from it; as believing that he that is ſeparated from the whole body, is alſo ſeparated from the Head.

Mr. J.

Sir,

The want of a Scribe hath forced me to fail a little in point of time: but I hope you will excuſe him, who deſires to ſerve you,

W. J.

June 22. 1660.

R. B.

Sir,

Urgent unavoidable buſineſs conſtrained me to delay my return to your ſolutions, or explications of your definitions, till this June 29. 1660.

When you deſire me to anſwer any ſuch Queſtions, or explain any doubtful paſſages

of mine, I ſhall willingly do it. In the mean time you may ſee, while your terms are ſtill unexplained, and your Explications or Definitions ſo inſignificant, how unfit we are to proceed any further in diſpute, till we better underſtand each other as to our terms and ſubject: which when you have done your part to, I ſhall gladly, if God enable me, go on with you, till we come (if it may be) to our deſired iſſue. But ſtill I crave your performance of the double task you are engaged in.

Richard Baxter.

28 MR 59

Appen-

Appendix.

THe moſt that I here ſaid againſt the *ſucceſſive Viſibility of our Church*, is reduced by them to the point of Ordination. They ſay, *We can have no Church without Paſtors: no Paſtors without Ordination; and no Ordination but from the Church of* Rome: *therefore when we broak off from the Church of* Rome, *we interrupted our ſucceſſion, which cannot be repaired but by a return to them.* This is the ſum of moſt of their diſcourſes, in what ſhape ſoever they appear. To which I anſwer.

1. As [*a Church*] is taken for a *Community of Chriſtians*, which are really members of the Church univerſal, ſo it may *ad eſſe* be without Paſtors. But the *Catholike Church* can *never* be *without* them: nor yet, any true *Political*, *organized*, *particular* Church.

2. It is contrary to the Papiſts own opinion that Ordination of their particular Paſtors, is neceſſary to the being of a true particular Church. *Bellarmine* granteth (*Lib.* 3. *de Eccleſ. c.* 10.) that it is indeed

to us uncertain that our Paſtors have *poteſtatem ordinis & juriſdictionis*; and that we have but a moral certainty that they are true Biſhops: though we may know that they hold Chriſts place, and that we owe them obedience; and that to know that they are *Our Paſtors, non requiritur nec fides, nec Character Ordinis, nec legitima electio, ſed ſolum ut habeantur pro talibus ab Eccleſia.* [i. e. *It is not requiſite, that they have faith, or the Character of Order, or lawful election; but only that they be taken for ſuch by the Church.*] And if it be enough that *their* Church repute their Paſtors to be elected, ordained, and believers, though they are not ſo indeed; then can no more be neceſſary to *ours*. We repute *ours* as confidently to be lawfully *elected* and *ordained* as they do *theirs*.

3. It is contrary to the Papiſts own opinion, that *any Conſecration* (much leſs *Canonical*) is neceſſary to the *being* of *their Univerſal Head*. I need not cite their *Authors* for this; as long as you have 1. The *Hiſtory* of their *Practices*: And 2. The confeſſion of this learned man that I diſpute with, in the explication of the term [*Pope*] in theſe his laſt Papers. And that which is not neceſſary to their Pope, cannot

cannot by them be made neceſſary to our Biſhops.

4. Nothing in Church Hiſtory more certain, then that the Church of *Rome* hath had no continued ſucceſſion of a truely elected, or ordained Pope according to their own Canons. 1. If Infidelity or Hereſie judged by a Council (in the caſe of *Honorius*, *Joh.* 23. *Eugenius*, &c.) will not prove a nullity and interciſion. 2. If Simony, Murder, Adultery, *&c.* will not prove it. 3. If about fourty years Schiſme at once will not prove it: none knowing who was the true Pope, but by the prevalency of his ſecular power; and their writers confeſſing that it is known to none but God. 4. If intruſion without any juſt election will not prove it; Then there is no danger to thoſe Churches that are lyable to no ſuch accuſations. But if any or all of theſe will prove it, the *Roman* interciſion is beyond diſpute, as I ſhall further manifeſt on any juſt call, if it be denyed.

5. The *ſtanding Law* and *Inſtitution of Chriſt*, is it that gives the *Power* (by *impoſing* the *duty*) of Miniſtration: and *Ordination* only determineth of the *perſon* that ſhall receive it (together with election,) and ſolemnizeth it by Inveſtiture: as Corona-

tion to a King, that is a King before.

I have already proved that an *uninterrupted ſucceſſion of Regular Ordination* is no more neceſſary to the *being* of a *Church*, then *uninterrupted ſucceſſion of Regular Coronation* is to the *being* of a *King* or *Kingdom*: which I am ready to make good.

6. This whole caſe of *Ordination* I have already ſpoken to (ſo carefully and fully according to my meaſure) in my *ſecond Diſpute of Church Government*, that I ſhall ſuppoſe that man hath ſaid nothing to me, requiring my reply, on this point, that doth not anſwer that. And to write the ſame thing here over again, cannot fairly be expected.

7. *Voetius de deſperata cauſa Papatus*, hath copiouſly done the ſame againſt *Janſenius*, which they ſhould anſwer ſatisfactorily before they call for more.

8. The *Nullity* which they ſuppoſe to make the *Interciſion*, is either the *Ordination* we had *from the Papiſt Biſhops before our Reformation*, or the *Ordination that we received ſince*. If the *former* be a nullity, then *all* the Papiſts Ordinations are null; and ſo they nullifie their Church and Miniſtry. That the *latter* is no nullity, we are ready to make good againſt any of them all.

Object.

Object. *But if you own your Ordination as from the Church of* Rome, *you own their Church.*

Anſw. We conſider them, 1. As *Chriſtian Paſtors.* 2. As *Popiſh Paſtors*; As *Chriſtian* Paſtors in the Catholike Church, their *Ordination* is no more a nullity than their *Baptizing*, (which we count valid.) But as *Popiſh*, they have no authority for either. Object. *But they gave both Baptiſm and Ordination as Papiſts, and it muſt be judged of by the intention of the giver, and receiver. Anſw.* It is the Baptiſm and Ordination of *Chriſts Inſtitution, as ſuch*, which was pretended to be *given* and *received:* Could we prove that they Adminiſtred any other or otherwiſe, they ſay they would diſown it: *As ſuch* therefore we muſt take it, till we can prove that they deſtroy the very eſſence of it. If it be given and taken *ſecondarily as Popiſh* the ſcab of their corruption *polluteth it*, but not *nullifieth it.* So they profeſs themſelves firſt *Miniſters of Chriſt*, and but *ſubordinately* (as they think) of the *Pope*: ſo much therefore as belongs to them in their *firſt* and *lawful* relation may be *valid*; though ſo much as reſpecteth their *uſurped relation* be *ſinful.* Had I been baptized or ordained by one of their Prieſts,

I would diſown all the corruptions of them, but not the baptiſm and ordination it ſelf.

9. There is no neceſſity to the being or well-being of a particular Church, that it hath continued from the Apoſtles daies, or that its particular Miniſtry have had no interciſion. If *Germany* were converted but lately to the Chriſtian Faith, it may be nevertheleſs a true part of the Catholike Church. If *Jeruſalem* had ſometime a Church, and ſometime none, it may have now a true Church nevertheleſs.

10. If our Ordination had failed by an interciſion, it might as well be repaired from *other Churches* (that have had a continued ſucceſſion) as from *Rome*. And much better; becauſe without participation of their peculiar corruptions. Or if any Biſhops that were of the Papal faction ſhould *repent* of their *Poperie*, and *not* of their *Ordination*, they might *Ordain* us as *Biſhops*, and repair our breach. And indeed that was the way of our *continued Ordination*. Many that repented that they were *Popiſh Prelates*, continued the office of *Chriſtian Biſhops*, and by ſuch our Anceſtors were Ordained. As *Chriſtianity* and *Epiſcopacy* were before *Popery*, and ſo are they ſtill ſeparable

ſeparable from it, and may continue when it is renounced. Beſides what I have more fully ſaid in the foreſaid diſpute of Ordination, I ſee no need of adding any more, againſt this Objection, about ſucceſſive Ordination and Miniſterial Power.

As to their other Objection (which they make ſuch a ſtir with, and take no notice of the Anſwer which we have ſo often given) viz. [*When every Sect pretend that they have the true Church and Miniſtry, who ſhall judge?*] I again Anſwer, There is a *Judicium privatum*, and *publicum*: A private judgement of diſcerning belongs to every man: The *publick judgement* is either *Civil* or *Eccleſiaſtical*. The *Civil judgement* is [who ſhall be thus or thus eſteemed of, in order to Civil encouragement or diſcouragement] (as by corporal puniſhments, or rewards:) This judgement belongeth only to the Civil Magiſtrate. The *Eccleſiaſtical judgement*, is in order to *Eccleſiaſtical Communion* or *Excommunication*. And ſo it belongs to thoſe with whom the perſon is in Communion, in their ſeveral capacities. The members of a particular Church, are to be judged Authoritatively by the Paſtors of that Church, (and by the people, by a *Private* judgement of *Diſcerning*.) *Paſtors* ſhould

aſſociate

aſſociate for *Communion* of *Churches*: and ſo in order to that *Communion* of *Aſſociation*, it belongs to the ſeveral Aſſociations to judge of the *Members* of the *Society*: which yet is not by a publike *Governing judgement*: For in Councils or Aſſociations, the *Major Vote* are not properly the *Governors* of the *leſſer part*: But thoſe that are out of capacity of *Communion*, have nothing to do to judge of the *Aptitude* of *Paſtors* or *Churches* in order to *Communion* or *non-Communion*. And for the *Pope*, he hath nothing to do with us at ſuch a diſtance, whoſe perſons and caſes are wholly unknown to him; he being neither our *Governour* nor our *Aſſociate*. But if we and our caſe were known to him, he may judge of us ſo far as we may judge of him. And other judgement (what ever men may ſay to deceive) there is none to decide our controverſies, but the *final judgement* of the *Univerſal Judge*, who is at the door.

28 MR 59

A

LETTER

Written to

Thomas Smith

A Papiſt, Concerning the Church of *Rome.*

LONDON, Printed, 1660.

BRITISH
MUSEUM

Reverend Sir,

THe noted ſanctity, admirable integrity, and extraordinary charity ſo eminently appearing in your pious actions, (and as I have ſome cauſe to think, the indelible characters of your ſacred function) hath animated me to make choice of your ſelf rather then any of your coat to this preſent addreſs: hoping your candour and tenderneſs will bear with what may be (by others leſs ſenſible of the value of immortal ſouls ſlighted) interpreted according to the candid and true ſenſe of your ſupplicant by you. It hath pleaſed the great and terrible Judge of heaven and earth to put me upon ſome thoughts more ſeriouſly then ordinary of my eternal eſtate, and to be ſomewhat doubtful (in the midſt of external perturbations) of thoſe internal grounds which I have formerly relyed upon. And truely Sir with all cordialneſs, my deſire is clearly to know the mind of my God, which were I truely ſatisfied in, I ſhould ſoon wave all other intereſts to entertain: and aſſuring my ſelf according to what I have ſeen and read, the Church of Rome, *to which I have long cleaved and adhered, to be the*

the pillar and ground of truth, *and that Catholike Church which the ancient Creed testifies, we are to believe in: My desire is to be as soon satisfied as may be of your thoughts,* whether it ever were a true Church, *which I suppose you will not deny, when you consider the first verse of the Epistle to the* Romans; *and if so,* when it made its defection? *The reason of my urging this is, because I think all other questions to be but going about the bush, and the true Church being proved, all arguments else easily are answered. I have heard Protestants aver the ancient maxime,* viz. Extra Ecclesiam non est salus. *Therefore I suppose it the only thing pertinent to my purpose, and necessary to salvation to enquire after. My occasions will suddenly draw me from these parts, unless I hear from you speedily: and doubt not Sir, but I am one who freely will resign my self to hear truth impartially. Therefore I beseech you to send something to me by way of satisfaction the next Saturday, after which you shall be more particularly sensible who the person is that applies himself to you, and in the interim subscribes himself, Sir,*

A thirsty troubled soul, and yours

Feb. 11. 1656. to his power, *Tho. Smith.*

Direct

Direct your Letter to me if you please to Mr. John Smiths *house next door to the sign of the Crown in the broad street,* Worcester. *Good Sir, be private for the present; otherwise it may be prejudicial to some temporal affairs agitating at this time.*

Sir,

THat you can have such charitable thoughts of one that is not of the *Roman* subjection, and of my function, being not received from the Pope, is so extraordinary, yea and contrary to the judgement of your writers, that I must needs entertain it with the more gratitude, and some admiration. And that you are so impartially willing to entertain the truth, (as you profess) though it be no more then the truth deserves of you, and your own welfare doth require; yet is the more aimiable in you, by how much the more rare in those of your Profession, so far as my acquaintance can inform me: for most of them that I have met with, understand not well their own Religion, nor think themselves much concerned to understand it, but refer me to others for a Reason of their hope. For my part, I do the more gladly entertain the occasion

caſion of this entercourſe with you (though unknown,) that I may learn what I know not, and may be true to my own conſcience in the uſe of all means that may conduce to my better information. And therefore I ſhall plainly anſwer your Queſtions according to the meaſure of my underſtanding; moſt ſolemnly profeſſing to you, that I will ſay nothing which comes not from my heart in plain ſimplicity, and that I will with exceeding gladneſs and a thouſand thanks come over to your way, if I can finde by any thing that you ſhall make known to me, that it is the mind of God that I ſhould ſo do. And therefore I am deſirous, that if what I write to you ſhall ſeem unſound, you would not only afford me your own advice for the correction of it, but alſo the advice of the moſt learned of your mind, to whom you ſhall your ſelf think meet to communicate it. But on theſe conditions. 1. That it be a perſon of a tender conſcience, that dare ſpeak nothing but what he verily believes. 2. That he will argue cloſly, and not fly abroad or dilate Rhetorically. And for any divulging of it to your danger or hurt, you need not fear it: For theſe two grounds of my following anſwers; I ſhall here promiſe, 1. That I am ſo far from perſecuting

bloody

bloody desires against those of your way, that their own bloody principles and practices where they have power (in *Italy*, *Spain*, &c.) hath done much to confirm me, that the cause is not of God that must be so upheld and carried on. 2. And I am so far from cruel uncharitable censures of any that unfeignedly love the Lord Jesus and his truth, that it is the greatest motive to me of all other to dislike your Profession, because it is so notoriously against Christian charity, restraining the Catholike Church to your selves, and outing and condemning the far greatest part of Christians in the world, and that because they believe not in the Pope, though they believe in God the Father, Son and Holy Ghost, and all that the Primitive Church believed. I am so Catholike, that (according to my present judgement) I cannot be of your Church, because it is so little Catholike. I am of the one universal Church, which containeth all the true Christians in the world: And you are of a *Party* which hath separated it self from most of the Christians in the world. I am of that one body that is centred in Christ the Head; you are of a piece of this body, that hath centred in a man, and oft a confessed heretical wicked man, whom you

take while he lives to be the infallible Judge and foundation of all your faith and hope; and when he is dead, perhaps pronounce him to be in hell (as *Bellarmine* did Pope *Sixtus*, and others commonly.) I know, as every Sect hath a kind of unity among themselves, however divided from all the rest of the Church, so also hath yours: but nothing will satisfie me but a Catholike Unity, Church and Faith. So much being premised, I answer your Questions.

Quest. 1. *Whether the Church of* Rome *was a true Church in the Apostles dayes?*

Answ. The word [*Church*] signifies more things then one. 1. Sometime it is used to signifie the whole mystical body of Christ, containing all and only those that are justified, whom *Bellarmine* calleth living members. And in this sense the Church of *Rome* in the Apostles dayes was not *the Church*, but the justified members were part of the Church. 2. Sometime it is used to signifie all that *profess* true Christianity in the world: And thus the Church of *Rome* was not *the Church*, but part of it. 3. It is oft used by your writers to signifie one Church, that by Prerogative is the Head or Mistris of all

all Christians in the world, to which they must all be subject, and from which they must receive their name, as the Kingdom of *Mexico*, of *Tripolis*, of *Fez*, &c. are so called from the chief Cities of the same name, and from which they receive their Faith and Laws, as the body hath life and motion from the head or heart. In this sense the Church of *Rome* was *no Church* in the Apostles dayes. 4. Sometime it is used to signifie one particular Church, associated for personal Communion in Worship. And thus the Church of *Rome* was a true Church in the Apostles dayes. 5. Sometime it is used to signifie a Collection or Conjunction of many particular Churches (though not all) under the Bishop of one Church, as their Patriarch or Metropolitan. And thus the Church of *Rome* was no Church in the Apostles dayes, but about two hundred years after Christ it was.

It is only the *Church* in the third of these senses, that is in controversie between the *Roman* and Reformed Churches. Now to your next Question.

Quest. 2. *When was it that the Church of* Rome *ceased to be a true Church?*

Answ. In the first, second, and third sences it never ceased to be a true Church: for it never was one. In the first and second sence it never was one either in title or claim, (I hope.) In the third, it was never one in Title, nor yet in claim for many hundred years after Christ: but now it is. Therefore the Question between us should not be, *when it ceased*, but *when it begun* to be such *a Capital Ruling Church, Essential to the whole?*

In the fifth sence it never ceased otherwise then as it is swallowed up in a higher Title. It begun to be a *Patriarchal Church*, about two or three hundred years after Christ: and it ceased to be *meerly Patriarchal* when it arrogated the Title of *Universal* or *Mistris of all.*

In the fourth sence, the Question is not so easie, and I shall thus answer it. 1. By speaking to the use of the Question. 2. By a direct answer to it.

1. It is of small concernment to my salvation or yours, to know whether the Church of *Rome* be *a true particular Church or not*: no more then to know whether the Church of *Thessalonica*, or *Ephesus*, or *Antioch*, be now a true Church. In charity to them I am bound to regard it, as I am bound

to

to regard the life of my neighbour: But what doth it concern my own life, to know whether the *Mayor* and *Aldermen* of *Worceſter* or *Gloceſter* be dead or alive? So what doth it concern *my Salvation* to know whether the Church of *Rome* be now a true particular Church? If I lived at the *Antipodes* or in *Æthiopia*, and had never heard that there is ſuch a place as *Rome* in the world (as many a thouſand Chriſtians doubtleſs never heard of it) this would not hinder my ſalvation, as long as I believed in the bleſſed Trinity, and were ſanctified by the Spirit of Grace. So that, as I am none of their Judge, ſo I know not that it much concerneth me, to know whether they be a true particular Church, ſave for charity or communion.

2. Yet I anſwer it more directly. 1. If they do not by their errors ſo far overthrow the Chriſtian faith which they profeſs, as that it cannot practically be believed by them, then are they a true particular Church, or part of the univerſal Church. 2. And I am apt to hope at leaſt of moſt that they do not ſo hold their errors, but that they retain with them ſo much of the eſſentials of Religion as may denominate them a *true profeſſing Church*. More plain-

ly: *Rome* is conſidered firſt *as Chriſtian*, ſecondly *as Papal*: *As Chriſtian*, it is a *true Church*: As *Papal*, it is *no true Church*: For *Popery* is not the *Church* according to Chriſts Inſtitution, but a *dangerous corruption* in the Church. As a Leproſie is not the *man*, but the *diſeaſe* of the man. Yet he that is a *Leper* may be a *man*. And he that is a *Papiſt* may be a *Chriſtian*: But 1. Not *as he is a Papiſt*. 2. And he is *but a leprous* or diſeaſed Chriſtian.

So much to your Queſtions.

By this much you may ſee that it no way concerneth me to prove *when* Rome *ceaſed to be a true Church*. For if you mean ſuch a Church as *Corinth*, *Philippi*, *Epheſus*, &c. was, that is, but *a part of the Catholike Church*, ſo I ſtick not much, ſaving in point of *Charity*, whether it be true or falſe. But if you mean as your party doth, *a Miſtris Church to Rule the whole, and denominate the Catholike Church* [*Roman*,] ſo I ſay, its *Uſurpation* is not ceaſed (that's the miſery) and its juſt *title* never did begin: and its *claim* was not of many hundred years after Chriſt: ſo that your Queſtion requireth no further Anſwer.

But

But what if you had put the Queſtion, At what time it was that your Church began to *claim* this univerſal Dominion? I ſhould give you theſe two anſwers. 1. When I underſtand that it is of any great moment to the deciſion of our controverſie, I ſhall tell you my opinion of the man that firſt laid the claim, and the year when. 2. But it is ſufficient for me to prove, that from the beginning it was not ſo. Little did the Biſhops of *Rome* before *Conſtantines* dayes, dream of governing all the Chriſtians in the world. But when the Emperours became Chriſtians, their great favour and large endowments of the Church, and the greatneſs and advantage of the Imperial City did give opportunity to the Biſhop of *Rome* (as having both riches, and the Emperours and Commanders ears) to do ſo many and great favours for moſt other Churches, in preſerving and vindicating them, that it was very eaſie for the Biſhop hereby to become the chief Patriarch (which he was more beholden to the Emperour for, then to any Title that he had from Chriſt or *Peter*.) And then the quarrel with *John* of *Conſtantinople* occaſioned the thoughts of an univerſal Headſhip; which *Gregory* did diſclaim and abominate, but *Boniface* after him, by the

grant of a murdering trayterous Emperour, did obtain : But ſo as the See ſwelled before into a preparatory magnitude.

And if we could not tell you the time within two hundred years and more, it were no great matter, as long as we can prove *that it was not ſo before.* For who knows not that even ſome Kings in *Europe* have come from being *limited Monarchs,* to be *abſolute,* and that by ſuch degrees, that none can tell the certain time. Nay I may give you a ſtranger inſtance. The Parliaments of *England* have part in the legiſlative power: And yet I do not think that any Lawyer in *England* is able to prove the juſt time, yea or the age, (or within many ages) when they firſt obtained it: which yet in ſo narrow a ſpot of ground may be eaſilier done, then the time of the Popes uſurpation over all the world. For it could not be all at once: for one Country yeilded to his (late) claim in one age, and another in another age, and many a bloody battle was fought before he could bring the *Germane* Emperours and Chriſtian Princes to ſubmit to him fully.

3. But let me tell you one thing more; Though as to *an arrogant claim,* the Pope is Head and Governour of all the Catholike Church,

Church, and *Rome* their Miſtris, (as the Pope makes Patriarchs of *Antioch*, *Alexandria*, and *Hieruſalem*, that never come near the place or people,) yet as to any *poſſeſſion* or *acknowledgement* on the Churches part, he *was never univerſal Head*, nor *Rome the Miſtris* to this day. For the greater half of the Chriſtians did never ſubject themſelves to him at all, nor come under his power. So that the Pope even now in his greateſt height, is only the head of the univerſal Church by his *own claim*, and *naming himſelf ſo*, without any *Title given* by *God*, or *acknowledged* by *men*, and without having ever been *poſſeſſed* of what he claims. The King of *France* doth ſcarce believe that the King of *England* was King of *France*, for all that he put it into his title: nor do the *Swedes* take the *Pole* for their King, becauſe he ſo calls himſelf. I am ſure if the *Turkiſh* Emperour call himſelf the *Emperour of the world*, that doth not prove that he is ſo. *Rainerius* the Popes Inquiſitor (*in catal. poſt. lib. cont. Waldenſ.*) ſaith plainly, *That the Churches that were planted by the Apoſtles themſelves* (ſuch as the Abaſſines, &c.) *are not ſubject to the Pope*. Once he ſaid the Government of *no Church* in the world, but *Rome* it ſelf: After that he grew to have the

the government of the *Patriarchate* of the *West*: since that he hath *got* some *more*, and *claimed all*; but never *got neer half* the Churches into his hands to this day. Do I need then to say any more to disprove his universal Headship, and that *Rome* is not the Catholike Ruling Church?

But having gone thus far in opening my thoughts to you, I shall forbear the adjoyning the proof of my Assertions, till I hear again from you. If I understand it, The Question between you and me to be debated, must be this, [*Whether the* Roman *Church was in the Apostles dayes, the Mistris or Ruling Church, which all other Churches were bound to obey, and from it were to be called the* Roman *Catholike Church?*] This I deny: and you must maintain, or else you must be no Papist. The motion that I make is, that by the next you will send me your Arguments to prove it (for it belongs to you to prove it, if you affirm it.) To which I will return you (if they change not my judgement) both my *Answers* and my *Arguments for the Negative*. And if you do indeed make good but this one Assertion, I do here promise you, that I will joyfully and resolvedly turn Papist: and if you *cannot* make it good, I may expect that you

should

ſhould no longer adhere to *Rome as the Ruling* or *Catholike Church*, and *the Pillar and Ground of Truth*; though charity ſhould allow it to be [*a Catholike Church*] that is a *member of the Catholike Church*, which is *indeed* the Pillar and Ground of Truth, wherein *Rome* may have a part as it is part of the Church: But I would it were not a moſt dangerouſly diſeaſed part. I crave your reply with what ſpeed you can, and remain,

An unfeigned lover of Truth and the friends of Truth.

Feb. 12. 165⅚.

Rich. Baxter.

The two following Letters, with the *Narrative*, are annexed only to ſhew the effect of the former.

Sir,

THough the buſineſs in agitation betwixt your ſelf and me, be the one thing neceſſary, and ſo to be preferred to all obligations, and buſineſſes of what concernment ſoever; yet a reſolution formerly taken up, hath diverted me

me somewhat from the present earnest prosecution thereof as it deserves. Temporal credit, though it should give way to things of eternal moment, yet it often sways the minds even of good men to neglect very important opportunities; which though I cannot excuse my self of, yet I desire it may be candidly interpreted, and that this may be accepted as a pledge *to an answer of what you have inserted. And I desire your next may be directed to me to* London, *to one Mr.* T. S. *who is a kinsman of mine, and no small admirer of your self. My thanks in the interim I return for the pains you have taken, which I hope through the mercy of God will not prove successeless for the future one way or other: the truth is, I have not divulged my self, or intentions as yet to any of my own way, which I know will be very troublesome; and I know I shall be beset with enemies from the ignorant, that way affected, as I* doubt not of help from the learned. *Yet as I told you in my former, without any carnal interest respecting, or outward troubles regarding, or inbred enemies combating, I resolve by the grace and assistance of God to be guided by truth impartially where I shall find it lye cleerest: and shall make it my work to implore the throne of mercy, that my understanding may be so enlightned,*

ned, as to discern truth from heresie. I desire Sir, if it may be no prejudice to your more earnest occasions, that I may have two or three lines from you by way of advice to meet me at London *at the place aforesaid, and assure your self, however God shall direct the successe, I shall rest, Sir,*

A thirsty desirer of truth,
and yours unfeignedly,

Feb. 16. 1656.

Tho. Smith.

If what you write to me be first sent to Mr. John Smiths *of* Worcester *as before, it will be safely sent to me. Good Sir, think not I slight a business of so eternal consequence by my neglect for the present; for none shall for the future be found more earnest to find out the mind of God, and he assisting, I hope, as chearfully to close therewith.*

Sir,

THe speed of your former applications to me by way of answer, incites me to the confirmation of those thoughts of your worth which were at my first addresses to you harboured in my brest; but the substance of your discourse

diſcourſe is a ſtronger motive. Although peradventure it may ſeem ſomewhat wonderful, that I ſhould ſo ſoon be brought over to the ſerious apprehenſions of the weight of what you have written to me; yet when you conſult the divine providence, and the Almighty direction which prompted me to the choiſe of your ſelf above others, upon grounds not altogether inſufficiently eſtabliſhed, which will be further made good when I ſhall have the happineſs of a perſonal entercourſe of communion with you, it will be certainly concluded upon by your ſelf and whoſoever it ſhall be communicated to, that the truth, which I have already ſeriouſly pondered, was the full aim of my intentions: which truth I ſhall impartially and joyfully entertain whereſoever I find it, without any thoughts at all of temporal or external diſcouragements, of which I have already conteſted with ſome, and expect (the Lord arm me againſt them) far greater. It is no ſmall thing that I ſhall be lookt upon as an Apoſtate, and ſo worthy of excommunication utterly; but I conclude according to St. Auguſtine *(I gueſs) that it is no ſhame to turn to the better, and withal I add (although I could inſert ſome ſmall exceptions) I am* to the main ſatisfied, *but yet in* ſome doubtful ſuſpence, *wherein I expect full ſatisfaction by* your book,

book, *which I received intimation from you is in the Press, and quickly to be published. If I might receive two or three lines from you in the interim, by way of establishment, it would be very gratefully accepted, in relation to the comfortable taking off those obstacles which I am certain to meet with in my change of judgement. I am very sorry that a person whom I know to be so tender of eternal souls in general, should be so continually taken off your important business daily by particulars. But being likewise sensible that you value a soul according to the worth of the same; I am encouraged to think, yea I verily believe, these rude things proceeding from a soul that is to rise or fall according to what is now determining between us, it will not be unacceptably received from, Sir,*

The admirer of your worth,

March 24. 165⅚.

Tho. Smith.

A Narrative of the caſe of T. S. *by his friend.*

Reverend Sir,

Mr. *Thomas Smith* late of *Martins* Ludgate *London* was brought up in the Proteſtant Religion, and for ſome years accounted an affectionate profeſſor thereof, by thoſe who were acquainted with his diligence and pains in writing out at large the notes he took of (Mr. *Calamies* and others) pious Sermons: but afterwards (not living up to the knowledge he had) he grew more remiſs in his practice, and in his company; and became a great affliction to his Father in his life-time by reaſon thereof, but a greater to his Mother after his Fathers death: which I ſuppoſe Mr. *Jacomb*, Mr. *Faulker* and others of her acquaintance cannot forget. But when ſhe underſtood the company he moſt frequented were Papiſts, who did at length take the boldneſs to reſort to her houſe, ſhe was very much perplexed, fearing that they had prevailed with her ſon to turn Papiſt, which ſhe ſoon found, as ſhe told me, to be ſo indeed. I was not willing to believe her report, but deſired

to

to ſatisfie my ſelf by diſcourſing with himſelf, hoping that I ſhould not have found his judgement determined that way, as I did to my great trouble find it to be, eſpecially in his juſtification of the Juriſdiction and Authority of the Pope, and other tenets of the Church of *Rome*. By this time he had waſted his Patrimony, and had run himſelf into debt ſo far, that he durſt not walk up and down the ſtreets as he had done: he went a Voyage to the Barbadoes, but returned thence in a worſe condition then he went, yet continued ſtill in the opinion he had received, notwithſtanding the great offence and trouble it was to thoſe from whom he expected relief and maintenance, whoſe hearts and hands were in that particular ſomewhat ſhut up againſt him, in ſo much that he was reduced to manifold extremities here. Afterwards, hopeleſs of any livelyhood here, he went over to *Ireland* where he had a kinſman; but meeting with diſappointment there of what he expected, he returned again into *England*, and ſteered his courſe to *Worceſter*, where he had another kinſman lived; during this Voyage I exchanged ſeveral letters with him, being deſirous to make him ſenſible of the hand of God eminently out againſt him, hedging up

his way with thorns everywhere, which I desired might be in order to his return to God, looking upon his condition to be manifestly desperate for ever, if he should refuse to return, and harden his heart against him. At *Worcester* he fell sick, which through Gods blessing brought him to a more serious consideration of his everlasting state which he apprehended to approach near. And it wrought some kind of doubt in him, touching the truth of some of the chief of those things which he had entertained as true about the Church of *Rome*, as he informed me by his letter; whereunto for his conviction and better satisfaction, I did advise him to apply himself unto Mr. *Baxter* of *Kederminster* (who I told him I did believe was a great lover of souls) which he by letter did as he told me, and that Mr. *Baxter* did return him an answer thereunto in writing, with liberty to shew it to any the most learned of his way; which when he came to *London* he shewed me, acknowledging himself much convinced by it: and the more taken, for that so large and full an answer with that liberty should be dispatch't to him with so much expedition, which as I remember he said he had the next day after he sent his. Yet was he confident, as he said, that it would

would be anſwered, and as he told me, he had left it with one that had undertaken it; He ſpake of its being ſhewn to Embaſſadors or an Embaſſador, and that within fourteen days he ſhould have an anſwer to it; but enquiring after it, I could never ſee any anſwer, nor could he notwithſtanding all his ſolicitations and provocations uſed, prevail to have an anſwer; which he ſeemed to be very much offended at; and at length, as he told me, thoſe with whom he had to do about it, were much offended with him: in ſo much that he intimated himſelf to be apprehenſive of danger from ſome of them: yet he ſeemed reſolved to adventure whatſoever might befall him in that reſpect, rather then he would ſtifle thoſe convictions, which by Mr. *Baxters* letter had been begotten in him; This letter of Mr. *Baxters*, together with [The Safe Religion] a Book which he did refer him to, either then or near that time in the preſs, which he went for and had of the Stationer upon Mr. *Baxters* account, (which I had almoſt forgot) gave him ſuch reſolution and ſatisfaction, that he thereupon altered his judgement and practice, and waited upon the Ordinances here in *London* in our Congregations for ſome time; I my ſelf having

seen him at the morning exercise in *London*: what further effects it wrought upon him I know not; for that he left the City and went over into *Flanders* as his Mother hath informed me, and is since dead:

Sir,

Your affectionate friend to serve you,

T. S.

For Mr. William Johnson.

Sir,

WHen I was invited to this Disputation with you, I entertained hopes, from your profest desires of close argumentation, that we should speedily bring it to such an issue, as might in some good measure answer our endeavours, in taking off the covering that Sophistry and carnal interest had cast upon the truth. When my necessary employments denyed me the leisure of reading over your second Papers for some weeks; and when the loss of my Reply by the Carrier, and the difficulty of procuring another Copy, had caused a little longer delay; you urged so hard for a Reply, as put me in some further

further hopes that you were reſolved to go through with it your ſelf. But after near a twelvemonths expectation of a *Rejoinder*, and of the *Proof of your own ſucceſſion from the Apoſtles*, being here at *London*, I deſired you to reſolve me, whether I might expect any ſuch *Return* and *Performance* from you, or not: And when you would not promiſe it, I took up the thoughts of publiſhing what had paſt between us: But upon further urging you, ſome moneths after, you renewed my hopes, which cauſed me to make ſome ſtay of my publication, and to deſire you to give me your ſenſe of the moſt uſed terms; (promiſing you that I ſhall do the like, when you require it; which I am ready to perform.) But yet I hear nothing to this day of your *Anſwer* to my Papers, or the *Performance* of what is incumbent on you for the juſtification of your Church: And therefore having waited and importuned you in vain ſo long, and finding by your laſt, that you cannot or will not ſo explicate your terms, as to be underſtood (without which there is no diſputing;) and alſo perceiving, that my abode in *London* is like to be but little longer; my *diſcretion* and the *ends* of my writing have commanded me, to forbear no longer the publication of what hath paſt between

tween us: For, though the work be not copious and elaborate, yet being on a ſubject, which your party do ſo much inſiſt upon, I am aſſured it may be of common uſe. And I know that the publication is no breach of any promiſe on my part, nor do I perceive how it can be any way injurious to you; and therefore I ſee nothing to prohibite it: And I am not willing to be uſed as Mr. *Gunning* and Mr. *Pierſon* were, by the partial unhanſome publication of another.

If yet I may prevail with you, to juſtifie your cauſe, as you are engaged, I muſt entreat you ſpecially to try your ſtrength for the proof of your own ſucceſſion: for we are moſt confident that its a notorious impoſſibility which you undertake. Our Arguments againſt it are ſuch as theſe.

1. That Church which ſince the time of Chriſt hath received a new eſſential part, hath not its being ſucceſſively from the Apoſtles. But ſuch is the Church of *Rome*: *Ergo*——

The Major is undenyable. The Minor is thus proved. A Vice-Chriſt, or Vice-head, or Governour of the Univerſal Church is an eſſential part of the now Church of *Rome*. But a Vice-Chriſt, or Vice-head, or Governour of the Univerſal Church, is new, or a novelty, (or hath not been from the time of

of Chriſt on earth:) *Ergo*, the Church of *Rome* ſince the time of Chriſt, hath received a new eſſential part. The novelty I have here and elſewhere proved: And *Blondel* and *Molinæus* againſt *Perron* have done it more at large.

2. That Church which hath had frequent and long interceiſions in its head or eſſential part, hath not had a continued ſucceſſion from the Apoſtles. But ſuch is the Church of *Rome*: *Ergo*——

The Minor is here proved: and ſome hints of it are in the Appendix.

3. That Church which hath had many new eſſential Articles of Religion, hath not had a continued ſucceſſion from the Apoſtles: (For if the eſſence be new, the Church is new.) But ſuch is the Church of *Rome*. *Ergo* —

Firſt it is commonly maintained by you that all *Articles* are *Eſſential* or *Fundamental*: and you deride the contrary doctrine from the Proteſtants.

Secondly, that you have had many *new Articles* of Religion (of faith and points of worſhip) is proved by our writers, and your own confeſſions. See *Molinæus de Novit. Papiſmi*. Prove a ſucceſſion of all that is *de fide* determined in your Councils, or but of all

all in Pope *Pius* his Creed, and the Council of *Trent* alone; or of all that with you is *de fide* of thoſe two and thirty points which I have named in my *Key for Catholikes*, p. 143, 144, 145. *Chap.* 25. *Detect.* 16. and I will yeild you all the cauſe: or I will profeſs my belief of every one of thoſe points of which you prove ſuch a ſucceſſion, as held by the Catholike Church, as you now hold them.

Read and anſwer my *Detect.* 21. *Cap.* 33. in my *Key for Catholikes*.

And how far you own Innovations, ſee what I have proved, *ibid. cap.* 35. and 36.

But theſe arguings being works of ſupererogation, I ſhall trouble you here with no more; but wait for ſuch *proof of all your eſſentials, as we give you of all ours*. In the mean time, I ſhall endeavour ſo to defend the *Truth*, as not to loſe or weaken *Charity*, but approve my ſelf

An unfeigned lover of the Truth and you.

Sep. 1. 1660.

Richard Baxter.

28 MR 59

FINIS.